DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 423 TM 860 246

AUTHOR	Dunbar, Donald A.; Salazar, Irene M.
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Gifted Program at Mellon Junior High School.
INSTITUTION	Mount Lebanon School District, Pittsburgh, PA.
PUB DATE	Sep 85
NOTE	138p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academically Gifted; Administrator Attitudes; Educational Assessment; Individualized Education Programs; Interviews; Junior High Schools; Needs Assessment; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Participation; *Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Questionnaires; *Talent; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Mellon Junior High School PA; Mount Lebanon School District PA; Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh)

ABSTRACT

The Gifted and Talented Program (GAT) of the Mellon Junior High School, Mt. Lebanon School District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, was evaluated in 1985. Questionnaires were sent to 139 parents and 50 academic teachers. In addition, 9 teachers, 4 administrators, and 12 parents were interviewed. Responses were summarized in detail regarding 14 topics, including: meeting gifted students' needs, motivation, staff knowledge of student needs and the GAT plan, usefulness of the individual educational programs, student progress reports, mainstreaming, curriculum objectives, parents' satisfaction, provision of enrichment, use of Coordinator's and Librarian's services, and providing for underachievers. It was concluded that parents desired more visible evidence of the GAT program's implementation. They also suggested increased individualized projects, parent-teacher communication, and extracurricular activities. Teachers generally felt the program was being implemented, and welcomed inservice sessions on daily concerns. Both groups felt that improved individualized educational programs would be valuable. (Extensive appendices include the interview and questionnaire instruments, program descriptions, and program plans.) (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269423

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Dunbar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AN EVALUATION OF THE GIFTED PROGRAM

AT

MELLON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mt. Lebanon School District
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228

By

Donald A. Dunbar
Program Evaluation Coordinator

and

Irene M. Salazar
Evaluation Consultant

Submitted to

Allan W. Blacka, Superintendent
Mt. Lebanon School District

September 1985

Paper accepted for presentation
at the American Educational
Research Association Conference,
San Francisco, April 1986.

CONTENTS

List of Tables iv

Lists vii

1. Introduction 1

2. Design of the Study 2

3. Findings
   - Does the program meet the needs of the gifted students? 6
   - Does the program help students develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter? 8
   - Do staff members feel that they have sufficient information about the needs of gifted students? 10
   - Are teachers knowledgeable about certain key features of the GAT plan? 12
   - Does the IEP Supplement provide information that teachers and parents find useful? 14
   - Does the system of reporting pupil progress give parents of GAT students adequate information about their child's progress in the GAT program? 16
   - Do parents understand the mainstream grouping practices of the Junior High School program? 17
   - Do parents understand the kinds of instructional objectives included in the curriculum? 18
   - What is the parents' level of satisfaction with the program? 19
   - Are teachers of regular courses providing GAT students with enrichment? 20
   - To what extent are academic teachers utilizing the service of the Gifted Program Coordinator? 22
   - To what extent are the academic teachers utilizing the services of the librarian? 23
   - What is done for the underachieving gifted student? 24
   - Are teachers of advanced courses expected to provide gifted students with enrichment, when appropriate? 25

4. Conclusion of the Study 26

5. Evaluation of the Study 27

6. Appendices
   - Mellon Administrator Interview Form 59
   - Gifted Program Coordinator Interview Form 64
   - Mellon Parent Interview Form 65
   - Mellon Teacher Interview Form 67
   - Mellon GAT Parents Survey Form 70
   - "A Prospective of Our Schools" 79
   - The Mt. Lebanon GAT Program Plan 81

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table I:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 1: the need to have individual strengths, abilities, and potentials recognized.	28
Table II:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 2: the need to provide opportunities for leadership.	28
Table III:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 3: the need to explore his/her own abilities.	29
Table IV:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 4: the need to experience higher levels of cognitive thinking.	29
Table V:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 5: the need to provide opportunities for creativity in the visual and performing arts.	30
Table VI:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 6: the need to provide a variety of learning experiences.	30
Table VII:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 7: the need to develop social skills appropriate to one's level of maturity.	31
Table VIII:	Percentage of responses at "adequately met" or better range across the needs assessed.	31
Table IX:	Percentage of responses at "to some extent" met or better range across all needs assessed.	32
Tabe X:	Means and standard deviations of responses to needs questions.	32
Table XI:	Descriptive statistics of parent and teacher responses to motivation through enrichment in the classroom.	33
Table XII:	Descriptive statistics of parent and teacher responses to motivation through acceleration of course work.	33
Table XIII:	Descriptive statistics of teacher responses to motivation through special groupings within the mainstream.	34
Table XIV:	Means and standard deviations by parents and teachers on the extent to which certain approaches to learning help to develop motivation for advanced subject matter.	34
Table XV:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.	35
Table XVI:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by subject area on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.	35
Table XVII:	Number and percentages for teacher responses by years of experience on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.	36

		Page
Table XVIII:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of guiding students to pursue appropriate course objectives.	36
Table IXX:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of evaluating student accomplishment.	37
Table XX:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of counseling students regarding course selection for the coming year.	37
Table XXI:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement on providing information on a child's overall, present level of performance.	38
Table XXII:	Descriptive statistics of parents on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the depth of understanding of subject matter being studied.	38
Table XXIII:	Descriptive statistics of parents on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the level of involvement in classroom activities.	39
Table XXIV:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the appropriateness of learning goals.	39
Table XXV:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the appropriateness of learning objectives.	40
Table XXVI:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the method of evaluating a child's work.	40
Table XXVII:	Descriptive statistics of teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement for providing information on expected outcomes.	41
Table XXVIII:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the overall usefulness of the IEP Supplement.	41
Table XXIX:	Cumulative percentages of parents and teachers responding at the "moderately useful" or better level on the IEP Supplement aspects evaluated.	42
Table XXX:	Cumulative percentages of parents and teachers responding at the "slightly useful" or better level on the IEP Supplement aspects evaluated.	42
Table XXXI:	Means and standard deviations for parents and teachers in IEP Supplement aspects evaluated.	43

		Page
Table XXXII:	Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers in the usefulness of the regular system of reporting on pupil progress in providing adequate information on a child's progress in the GAT program.	43
Table XXXIII:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses to whether the IEP Supplement is an effective tool for communicating a student's expected level of performance.	44
Table XXXIV:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the extent they feel parents of GAT students understand that upper cognitive level of objectives are included in curriculum guides.	44
Table XXXV:	Descriptive statistics on parent responses by grade level on the overall level of satisfaction with the GAT program.	45
Table XXXVI:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the use of enrichment through differentiation of subject matter.	45
Table XXXVII:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on use of enrichment through complicated puzzle solving.	46
Table XXXVIII:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on use of enrichment through supplemental multi-level instructional materials.	46
Table XXXIX:	Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the use of enrichment through supplemental activities (i.e. field trips, co-curricular interest groups)	47
Table XL:	Numbers and percentages of teachers on the use of enrichment through community resources.	47
Table XLI:	Means and standard deviations on the number of times per year teachers by grade level and subject area confer with the Gifted Program Coordinator.	48
Table XLII:	Means and standard deviations on the number of times per year teachers by grade level and subject area confer with the librarian.	48
Table XLIII:	Numbers and percentages of parents responding to whether child is underachieving.	49
Table XLIV:	Numbers and percentages of parents attending an IEP conference at Mellon Junior High.	49
Table XLV:	Numbers and percentages of parents responding by grade level on whether they have sufficient information on their legal rights as parents of GAT students.	49
Table XLVI:	Numbers and percentages of GAT students by grade level selecting advanced math courses.	50
Table XLVII:	Numbers and percentages of GAT students selecting foreign language courses.	50

LISTS

Page

LIST I

Parental thoughts and suggestions on how to improve the GAT program for those needs which are not being adequately met. 51

LIST II

A summary of additional comments to the interview question in which teachers were asked if they thought there was a difference between the written GAT program and its actual implementation. 52

LIST III

Comments on ways to increase the utility of the IEP Supplement. 53

LIST IV

Parental comments on program design. 54

LIST V

Summary of responses on why teachers may not be using the enrichment options provided through the GAT resource center. 55

LIST VI

Parental comments on ways to improve the GAT program. 56

LIST VII

Teacher comments on how to improve the GAT program. 57

INTRODUCTION

Background

In February 1984 the Mt. Lebanon School District became committed to an evaluation of its Gifted and Talented (GAT) program. Due to expressions of parent concern about the program it was determined by Superintendent Allan W. Blacka that the program would be evaluated at the elementary, junior high and senior high school levels. The first phase was completed in October 1984 and an improvement committee for the elementary program was formed. This evaluation was begun in the same month. Study at the senior high school is scheduled for the 1985-86 school year.

Study of the Mellon GAT program began immediately after the elementary study was completed. Mr. Donald Dunbar was responsible for the determination of the focus and design of this study. Mrs. Irene Salazar was employed to act as the outside consultant. She designed and conducted the surveys and summarized the collected data. Mrs. Salazar and Mr. Dunbar collaborated in writing the conclusions and final report.

Groups Involved

The groups involved in this evaluation included the Mellon Junior High School staff, Mellon seventh and eighth grade students identified as GAT, and the parents of those students. Staff members participated in the planning of the study and took part in the survey process. Mellon GAT parents were involved in identifying the issues and concerns and in offering critiques of the survey instruments and findings.

Audiences Served

The primary audiences for this study are:

(1) Dr. Allan W. Blacka, Superintendent of Schools

(2) Dr. Henry A. Huffman, Director of Secondary Education

(3) Mr. John Wagner, Principal of Mellon School

(4) the Mellon school staff

(5) parents of Mellon GAT students

(6) the Mt. Lebanon School Directors.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Identifying the Major Questions

In December 1984 the following elements viewed as key program features were culled from the Mt. Lebanon GAT Plan and two earlier evaluations:

I. Program design
   1. philosophy
   2. goals

II. Preparation of staff
   3. provisions for staff development

III. Screening, selection, and placement of students
   4. screening for new students
   5. re-evaluating GAT students
   6. articulation with elementary and senior high school

IV. Development and implementation of IEPs
   7. the IEP Supplement
   8. review of IEPs by counselors
   9. utilization of standardized test results

V. Provision of appropriate instruction
   10. providing for the underachiever
   11. providing for the unmotivated
   12. course selection procedures
   13. provisions for enrichment
   14. provisions for acceleration
   15. provisions for individualized study
   16. provisions for projects
   17. provisions for differentiated assignments
   18. provisions for supervision of instructional activities related to GAT
   19. provisions for promoting cooperative efforts among staff
   20. provision of instructional materials, supplies, equipment
   21. provisions of library services
   22. provisions for stimulation and challenge

VI. Provision of information to students and parents
   23. student counseling
   24. notifying parents of newly identified students
   25. orienting parents
   26. reporting to parents

These features were placed into question form and distributed to Dr. Allan Blacka, Dr. Henry Huffman, Mrs. Beverly Sprowls (Secondary Schools Gifted Program Coordinator), Mr. John Wagner, and Mr. Daniel Moore (Director of Pupil Personnel Services). These persons were asked to rate the questions in terms of their potential for yielding useful information.

At this time Mellon GAT parents were invited, via the Mellon PTA Newsletter, to contact Mr. Dunbar if they wished to express their concerns or help with the evaluation. Six responded. Each was contacted by telephone and each scheduled for a one-hour

conference. All six attended. Approximately two weeks later a seventh person asked to be included. This person was not interviewed but was furnished with all of the information provided to the others.

Mellon teachers were invited to express their concerns about the program. Eight teachers responded to a questionnaire designed and distributed by Mrs. Sprowls for this purpose.

The opinions of these administrators, parents, and teachers were then used by Mr. Dunbar and Dr. Huffman to develop the evaluation questions and statements of expected performance.

1. Does the program meet the needs of gifted students?
2. Does the program help students develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter?
3. Do staff members feel that they have sufficient information about the needs of gifted students?
4. Are teachers knowledgeable about certain key features of the GAT plan?
5. Does the IEP Supplement provide information that teachers and parents find useful?
6. Does the system of reporting pupil progress give parents of GAT students adequate information about their child's progress in the GAT program?
7. Do parents understand the mainstream grouping practices of the Jr. H.S. program?
8. Do parents understand the kinds of instructional objectives included in the curriculum?
9. What is the parents' level of satisfaction with the program?
10. Are teachers of regular courses providing GAT students with enrichment?
11. To what extent are academic teachers utilizing the service of the Gifted Program Coordinator?
12. To what extent are academic teachers utilizing the services of the librarian?
13. What is done for the underachieving gifted student?
14. Are teachers of advanced courses expected to provide gifted pupils with enrichment, when appropriate?

Three questions of a research nature were also identified:

1. What percent of the Jr. H.S. parents surveyed have attended a Jr. H.S. IEP conference?
2. Are gifted students selecting advanced math courses in Grade 7? Grade 8?
3. Are gifted students selecting foreign language courses for Grade 7? Grade 8?

Evaluation Approach

Dr. Huffman and Mr. Dunbar agreed that the general approach of the study would be to collect information that would be of assistance in directing and improving the program. The purposes would be:

1. To determine the extent to which the program activities and services are being provided.
2. To provide information for modifying or explicating the program as needed.
3. To assess the extent to which staff accept and are able to carry out their role responsibilities.
4. To find out how staff and parents judge the overall quality of the Mellon GAT program.
5. To identify the changes that need to be made in the program plan.

The Sample

It was decided that teachers, parents, and administrators would be surveyed by questionnaire and interview. The total population of parents of GAT students (139) and Mellon academic teachers (50) were asked to complete the questionnaire. The parent surveys were sent through U.S. mail. A metered return envelope addressed to Mrs. Salazar at a post office box was included. Reminder post cards, hand-signed by Mr. Dunbar, were sent to all parents one week later.

The teacher questionnaires were distributed to all of the Mellon academic teachers via school mail. Return to Mrs. Salazar in a sealed envelope, via the Gifted Coordinator, was requested. Teachers, like parents, were asked to respond anonymously.

For the interviews 9 teachers were randomly selected from the population of Mellon academic teachers. The selection was intended to provide representation across grade levels and six academic subject areas. Four key administrators were interviewed on certain key questions.

Twelve Mellon parents were selected for telephone interviews. The parents were randomly selected across three student IQ groupings, gender, and grade level. These three variables were originally considered important factors to be controlled for an accurate interpretation of the final results.

Procedures

Each of the instruments mentioned above were pilot-tested for clarity and formatting corrections. Throughout the evaluation process, informal meetings were held by various members of the evaluation team to discuss problems, revisions, and new ideas.

Schedule of Major Evaluation Activities

DATE	ACTIVITY
1985	
January - April	Finalized design plans Wrote questionnaires/interviews Pilot tested surveys

May - June	Administered teacher/parent surveys Conducted teacher, administrator, and parent interviews
May - June	Collected data and prepared for preliminary analyses Follow-up on unreturned mail surveys
June	Preliminary presentations of results to evaluation team
July	Final data analysis/interpretation of results
August-September	Presentation of results to the Superintendent, the School Board, Mellon administrators, parents, and teachers via written and verbal reports.
September	Dissemination of results to the general Mt. Lebanon public via written newsletter report

The Instruments

Five instruments were used to collect information from the participants of the study. A teacher questionnaire was written to obtain teacher views on the implementation of the GAT plan as well as receive suggestions for improvements for the future. Supplemental information such as subject area currently teaching and years experience was also collected. The parent questionnaire addressed the parents' knowledge of and level of satisfaction with the program operations and attempted to identify ways to broaden the school-parent communication network. The small sample of teachers, parents, and administrative personnel interviewed by Mrs. Irene Salazar used an open-ended survey format to allow for an increased perception of concerns which may not have been derived through the use of the mail surveys alone.

Data Analysis

The survey data was coded onto machine scorable op scan sheets and transferred to storage space on the University of Pittsburgh's computer system. (ex. A forty percent reliability check was performed on the data for accuracy. The questionnaire responses were compared to the Scan Sheet codes and to the computer print-out of the data.) Coding errors were corrected on the computer. Frequency distributions and descriptive statistics were prepared to show total and grade level responses to each questionnaire item for parents and teachers.

For the open-ended questions, the responses were copied, cut and pasted onto index cards and organized by question. Lists of similar responses were written and included in the final reports.

RESULTS

1. Key element. Does the program meet the needs of the gifted students?

   Standard of performance. Seventy-five percent of the teachers and parents surveyed will indicate that the program meets the needs of their student/child.

   Basis for audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers. Personal interviews with 4 key GAT administrative personnel. Telephone interviews with 12 GAT parents randomly selected to include equal representation on gender, grade level, and IQ groupings of students. Personal interviews with 9 Mellon teachers randomly selected to include a representation of each grade level and six academic subject areas.

   Actual performance. Forty-four out of 139 families and 25 out of 50 Mellon teachers surveyed responded to the needs questions. One-hundred percent of the interviewees also responded.

   Across all of the specific needs which were addressed, the parent responses were below the 75% criterion level of acceptability. Although teacher responses were somewhat higher than those of the parents, only one response set showed that at least 75% of the teachers felt this particular need (i.e. the need to provide a variety of learning experiences) was being adequately met. Refer to Tables I through VII for a distribution of responses on each need assessed for parents and teachers. Refer to Table VIII for percentages on each need at "adequately met" criterion.

   At the next lower criterion level, which indicates the percentage of persons who felt a need was being met "to some extent", the parent responses again fell below the criterion. The teacher responses, on the other hand, were much higher. Refer to Table IX. For teacher responses on the fine arts need it should be noted that many teachers were not sure of an answer to this question and did not reply. When the fine arts response is adjusted for the non-response factor, the percentage at the "some extent" level becomes 75 and meets the criterion. The lowest percentage for parents fell at 24, for fine arts. For the teachers, the lowest percentage fell at the need to develop social skills (72%). The mean responses for all needs are presented in Table X. For teachers, the mean responses fell between "adequately" (2.0) and "to some extent" (1.0) with all but one response greater than 1.5. The parent means fell between "not at all" (0.0) and "adequately" (2.0) with most of the responses close to the "to some extent" marker. None of the parent responses reached 1.5. The standard deviation of responses of both groups was high indicating a wide spread of responses.

   Across grade levels for parental responses there seemed to be no differences in patterns of responses. Both grade levels had responses which were spread over the continuum (0-3) with slightly higher concentrations at the extremes. For the eighth grade parents especially, the opposing extreme responses were noted for the "visual arts" and "variety of experiences." And, 60% of the seventh grade parents felt that the "social skills" need as "not at all" being met for their children.

   For teacher responses across the years of teaching experience continuum there was no apparent difference in response patterns. Across grade levels, the eighth grade teachers tended to respond slightly lower on the "leadership" and "explore abilities" need while the seventh grade teachers responded slightly lower on the "social skills" need. This coincides with the seventh grade parent response on the "social skills"

need. Teachers of both levels responded high (i.e. 50% on "to a great extent") for the "cognitive thinking" need being met. For subject areas, no apparent trends were found. However the responding science teachers agreed 100% that the "cognitive thinking" need was being met to a great extent.

The Mellon administrators of the GAT program were personally interviewed in lieu of completing a formal questionnaire. In response to the question, "Does the GAT program meet the needs of the gifted students?" all of the respondents indicated that, generally speaking, the program did meet the needs of the students. Opportunities are offered to the students by the teachers but the degree of utilization of these opportunities differs across individual students and teachers.

Findings. **In general, both parents and teachers believe that the needs of the GAT students are being met to some small degree which is less than adequate.** In looking at the parental responses to a request for suggestions on how better to meet the needs of the students, the parents offered a variety of opinions. See List I. Many parents feel that the regular program at Mellon is, in itself, an excellent one, but they do not believe that anything other than this regular program is being offered to their children.

Directions for further study.

1. Organize extra-curricular activities for students that would allow students to explore their own special interests with others of similar interests in addition to allowing opportunities for increased social skills development. Encourage parents of GAT students to participate in these activities.

2. Increase communication with parents by providing an interim type of progress report on their child's enrichment activities.

3. Allow members of GAT special interest groups to present topics in the classroom.

4. Allow parents to become more knowledgeable on the curricular content by providing a list of enrichment options available to the child.

2. Key element. Does the program help students develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter?

Standard of performance. Seventy-five percent of the teachers and parents surveyed will indicate that the program helps students develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter.

Basis for audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers. Telephone interviews with 12 GAT parents randomly selected to include equal representation on gender, grade level, and IQ groupings of students.

Actual performance. Forty-two out of 139 GAT parents, 24 out of 50 Mellon teachers, and 100% of the parent interviewees responded to the motivation questions.

For both parents and teachers, the 75% motivation criterion was not met. The percentages obtained at the "adequately met" or above criterion for teachers were as follows: Forty-four percent felt that enrichment in the classroom helped to develop motivation, 56% felt that acceleration helped to develop motivation, and 44% felt that special groupings within the mainstream adequately helped to develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter. Parental responses at the "adequate" or above level were 28% for enrichment and 32% for acceleration.

The percentage of responses which indicate that motivation was being stimulated "to some extent" or better by the enrichment, acceleration, and special grouping options were: 68%, 88%, and 56% for teachers and 52% and 60% for parents. Parents were not questioned on the effectiveness of special groupings within the classroom. Refer to Tables XI, XII, and XIII for a distribution of responses to each program approach to stimulating motivation.

The teacher means on these responses fall between 1.5 and 1.83 indicating a response level close to the "adequate" marker at 2.0. The parents means fall at 1.22 and 1.34 indicating a response closer to "some extent" at a code of 1.0. The standard deviations for both groups ranged from .88 to 1.34 indicating a wide spread of responses. See Table XIV for means and standard deviations by parents and teachers on each of the program approaches.

Across grade levels, parents show no noticeable differences in patterns of responses. For the enrichment option, the eighth grade parents show a slightly higher concentration of responses at the lower end of the scale with 47% of them indicating "not at all." For the acceleration option, the two opposing response extremes are again visible for the eighth grade parents. About as many eighth grade parents responded "to a great extent" as did to "not at all."

For teachers, no visible trends across years of teaching experience, subject area, or grade level were noticed. The responses were, for the most part, widely spread across the continuum.

Findings. **The responses show that neither parents nor teachers believe that enrichment or acceleration approaches offered at Mellon are adequately helping students to develop a high degree of motivation towards learning advanced subject matter.** Parallel to the responses to key element 1, teachers and parents, in general tend to agree that the approaches to learning are stimulating motivation to "some extent", the teacher's responses are again, slightly higher than those of the parents.

Directions for further study.

1. Organize special interest groups within the classroom.

2. Evaluate the enrichment options. Add and delete those which are not functioning well in the classrooms. Encourage teachers in similar subject areas to meet and share activities which are working effectively.

3. Allow for more individualized projects, accepting suggestions from the students, when possible.

4. Stimulate discussions among administrators, teachers, and parents on the broader motivation question: To what extent should motivation of a student be the responsibility of the student, the staff and/or the parent?

3. Key element. Do staff members feel that they have sufficient information about the needs of gifted students?

Standard of performance. Seventy-five percent of the staff feel that they have sufficient information about the needs of gifted students.

Basis for audit. Survey of 50 Mellon teachers. Personal interviews with 9 Mellon teachers, randomly selected to include a representation across grade level and academic subject area. Personal interviews with 4 key GAT administrators.

Actual performance. Twenty-three out of 50 Mellon teachers and 100% of the interviewees responded to the information question.

Teachers across all grade levels, all subject areas, and all levels of teaching experience agree to or above the 75% criterion level that they have enough information to adequately provide for the needs of the gifted students. Refer to Table XV, XVI, and XVII for a distribution of responses across grade level, subject area, and years of teaching experience.

Teacher responses on information in the past has been most helpful in providing for gifted student needs were:

1. the GAT resource center.
2. discussion, personal suggestions, and planned projects from the Gifted Program Coordinator.
3. in-service programs.
4. IEP Supplements from previous year's teachers.
5. informal conversations with past and current teachers.
6. identification of GAT students by grade level lists.
7. information from the Guidance Counselor.
8. coursework at a university.

Teacher responses on the kinds of information they would like to have provided in the future were:

1. briefings by administrators and staff.
2. more direct information on the GAT program.
3. more specific information from elementary school GAT performance in specific subject areas.
4. knowledge of child's special interests or talents.
5. staffings on underachieving students.
6. in-service programs on teaching the gifted, reviewing the plan, and focusing on problems in implementing the plan.
7. a clear definition of the role of the Gifted Program Coordinator.
8. an outline on what is available to the teacher and student through the GAT resource center.

In response to the interview question, "Do you feel that the staff has sufficient information about the needs of the gifted students?" all of the administrative staff agreed that the teachers are knowledgeable in this area. Some felt that only in-services which were particularly applicable to current problems in specific subject areas would be useful. Apparently many theoretical issues dealing with the teaching of the gifted had been presented at in-services in the past. As few new teachers

have been brought into the system, the need to review these theoretical issues is not felt, generally.

Findings. **In general, teachers and administrators feel that the staff at Mellon is knowledgeable about the topic of teaching the gifted students.** Many teachers have cited the GAT resource center and the Gifted Program Coordinator as very good sources of information. Other teachers feei they would benefit from more information on what the center has to offer. Although in-service programs are not thought to be in great need, a program provided to review the plan, the available enrichment options in each subject area, and to discuss problems in implementing the plan would be acceptable by most teachers.

Directions for further study.

1. Organize a teacher inservice which would:

   a. review the GAT plan.
   b. review enrichment options per subject area.
   c. focus on day-to-day problems of implementation.
   d. re-define the role and services of the Gifted Program Coordinator.
   e. include the guidance counselor.

2. Increase communication between staff and administration through more frequent briefings on current GAT topics.

3. Continue to provide IEP information from previous year's teachers. Insure that teachers are aware of location of GAT students' individual progress folders.

4. Key element. Are teachers knowledgeable about certain key features of the GAT plan?

Standard of performance. Ninety percent of the teachers surveyed will demonstrate knowledge of their responsibility for having GAT students (1) pursue appropriate course objectives and (2) evaluate student outcomes, and (3) counsel students regarding course selection for the coming year.

Note: At a preliminary meeting with teachers to discuss possible corrections/additions to the teacher survey, it was felt by several teachers that the key issue here was not an awareness of their responsibilities but an extent to which they were able to carry them out. Consequently, the focus of the question was changed to reflect this teacher input.

Basis for audit. Survey of 50 Mellon teachers. Personal interviews with 4 key GAT administrators and 9 Mellon teachers, randomly selected to include a representation of grade level and academic subject area.

Actual performance. Twenty-five out of 50 Mellon teachers responded to the survey questions on carrying out responsibilities. One-hundred percent of interviewees responded.

The extent to which teachers are able to carry out their GAT responsibilities varied slightly across objective. Refer to Tables XVIII to XX. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers felt they were able to adequately guide students to pursue appropriate course objectives, 71% felt they could adequately evaluate students accomplishments, and 89% felt they could adequately counsel students regarding course selections for the coming year.

No apparent trends were noticed across grade levels except that seventh grade teachers tended to respond on the lower end of the scale (i.e. to a little extent) on the "evaluating" question.

Subject levels and years of teaching experience showed no trends.

The administrators responded 100% that yes, without question, the staff is aware of their responsibility to carry out the mentioned key features of the GAT plan. The degree to which these features are carried out though, varied with the individual teacher.

A summary of responses to the interview question "Is there a difference in the GAT program as it is written and its actual implementation?" (List II) showed that of the teachers who were interviewed, there was unanimous agreement on the implementation of the plan. All interviewed agreed that the plan was being carried out as written. Many explained that their response was based on the fact that they have used the asterisk objectives included in their curriculum outline. Additional teacher-devised enrichment options were also used in some subject areas. There seems to be an agreement among the teachers that the basic, regular curriculum must first be mastered by any student before special enrichment options can be offered. As much of the curricula is already sufficiently challenging many GAT students spend a great deal of time keeping pace with the regular coursework and are not able to engage in the higher level enrichment options.

There also does not seem to be any standard method for documenting a student's

progress on an enrichment option. Some teachers use a formal self-devised report to record each GAT student's enrichment progress. Other teachers do not feel the need to document the options used as the paperwork is viewed as more time-consuming than useful.

Findings. Of the three responsibilities mentioned, more **teachers responded that they were adequately able to counsel students regarding course selections for the coming year.** The degree to which the guiding and evaluating responsibilities were noted as being carried out varied. Due to the small teacher survey response, an explanation for this variation was not evident in the data, and no conclusions could be reached, therefore, on why some teachers are able to carry out these responsibilities to a greater extent than others.

Directions for further study.

1. Investigate to a further extent the variation among teachers on carrying out GAT responsibilities.

2. Devise a standard method of documenting progress on enrichment options which would minimize teacher paperwork and maximize student involvement in the record keeping. Consider the use of computers for this purpose.

5. Key element. Does the IEP Supplement provide information that teachers and parents find useful?

Standard of performance. Seventy-five percent of the teachers and parents surveyed view the IEP Supplement as providing useful information.

Basis of audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers. Telephone interviews with 12 GAT parents, randomly selected to include equal representation on gender, grade level, and IQ groupings of students. Personal interviews with 9 Mellon teachers, randomly selected to include a representation of each grade level and six academic subject areas.

Actual performance. Thirty-six out of 139 parents, 25 out of 50 teachers and 100% of the interviewees responded to the IEP Supplement questions.

Several aspects of the supplement were evaluated according to their degree of usefulness. The responses for each aspect across parents and teachers are summarized in Table XXIX, which indicates the cumulative percentage of responses at the moderate or greater usefulness level. Tables XXI to XXVIII show the descriptive statistics of each aspect individually evaluated.

The parents and teachers tend to agree on the degree of usefulness of the IEP Supplement. Parent responses tend to be slightly higher than those of the teachers with a range of 52% to 64% of parents indicating a moderate or better level of usefulness of the IEP Supplement aspects evaluated. The teacher range of responses is 48% to 56% on the individual aspects. Neither of the responses met the expected criterion of 75% when considering "moderately useful" as the key indicator.

It should be noted, however, that an average of 35% of the parents indicated that they were unfamiliar with the IEP Supplement and were therefore unable to respond to the related items.

If the indicator "slightly useful" is used, the criterion is then met by many of the specific IEP Supplement aspects. Table XXX shows the cumulative percentages of responses at the "slightly useful" or better marker. The teacher range of percentages is 20% to 88%. The parent range is 66% to 83%. The indication here is that more parents than teachers responded at the lowest level, "not at all useful."

In looking at the overall usefulness aspect of the IEP Supplement, 48% of teachers and 56% of the parents indicated a moderate or better overall usefulness. Eight percent of teachers and 75% of the parents indicated a "slightly useful" or better degree of overall value of the IEP Supplement.

By comparing the means (Table XXXI) with the percentage (Table XXIX) one can see that the expected state of 75% would require a mean greater than 2.0 (moderately useful) in order to be met. Because of the wide dispersion of responses, the means do not accurately reflect the usefulness of the measured item.

Across grade levels the 7th grade teachers tended to respond slightly higher than the 8th grade teachers on the overall usefulness of the IEP Supplement. It is possible, however, that the teachers were evaluating different forms. During the teacher interviews, some seventh grade teachers reported that the IEP Supplement which they were evaluating was actually a copy of a report card type form which had been written in the 6th grade and distributed to them by the Gifted Program Coordinator

in the beginning of the year. On the back of this form, most of the 6th grade teachers had written anecdotal comments which are intended to help the 7th grade teachers. The form to which the 8th grade teachers were referring was the standard secondary IEP Supplement that does not include space for comments.

For parents, the grade level comparisons appeared to show no differences in response patterns. On the "method of evaluating" item, which showed the lowest overall cumulative percentage (66%) at the "slightly useful" level, 41% of the eighth grade parents responded "not at all useful."

The comments, which were obtained by asking both parents and teachers for ways to increase the utility of the IEP Supplement, were reflective of the quantitative data. Both groups suggested a need for more narrative on the supplement which could be provided by including an area for comments somewhere on the form. The teachers, however, mentioned that providing comments of this nature could be very time-consuming and suggested that the students should include a statement of goals, attitudes, and interests for each particular subject area. (See List III)

A need to change the form to reflect the specific subject areas was also mentioned. A suggestion of a skills checklist by subject areas was made.

Some of the parents felt that a report such as the IEP Supplement should be sent home throughout the year. The child's strengths and weaknesses should be noted on the report, as well as ways to support and encourage the child.

Findings. The range of responses on the individually evaluated aspects of the IEP Supplement indicates a non-standard use of the form. **Most of the parents and teachers who do utilize the information on the form, indicate that it is generally slightly useful.** The best type of information that the supplement provides is on a child's present level of performance. The least amount of usefulness is in indicating the method of evaluation.

Directions for further study.

1. Standardize use of the form across grade levels.

2. On the secondary form include a space for comments to be written by the teacher, if desired, on strengths, weaknesses, interests, and abilities of the child.

3. Include an addendum to the form, which could be devised by subject area teacher, that would allow the form to be more reflective of the specific subject area content.

4. Have the form specially printed to allow for a copy which could be sent home to the parents with the report card.

5. Revise the "basis for evaluating" item.

6. Revise the "expected outcome" item to include a more specific operational definition (i.e. expected outcome in reference to whom).

6. Key element. Does the system of reporting pupil progress give parents of GAT students adequate information about their child's progress in the GAT program?

Standard of performance. Eighty percent of the parents surveyed will state that they have received adequate information.

Basis for audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers.

Actual performance. Forty-five out of 139 parents and 23 out of 50 Mellon teachers responded to the reporting system questions.

Table XXXII shows a distribution of responses to the usefulness of the reporting system question.

Forty-six percent of the parents responded that the reporting system was at least moderately useful. A cumulative 58% reported that the information was at least slightly useful. Neither of these percentages match the expected criterion of 80%. Sixty-two percent of the teachers responded that they felt that the regular reporting system was at least moderately useful to parents. Sixty percent responded that the IEP Supplement is an effective tool for communicating a student's level of performance to the parents. (Table XXXIII)

Findings. **Parents and teachers agree that the regular system of reporting pupil progress does not generally provide satisfactory information to the parents on a GAT child's progress in the GAT program.**

Directions for further study.

Increasing the amount of information to parents suggests use of a revised IEP supplement which would be sent to parents at regular intervals.

7. Key element. Do parents understand the mainstreaming grouping practices of the Junior High School program?

Standard of performance. Seventy percent of the parents surveyed understand that the GAT program is not a "pull-out" program.

Basis for audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers.

Actual performance. Forty-six out of 139 parents and 25 out of 50 Mellon teachers responded.

Parents were asked to indicate the type of GAT program which they believed was being offered through Mellon. The data show 87% of the parents indicating a mainstreaming program; 4% indicating a pull-out program, and 9% were not sure. Additional comments on the program design are in List IV.

A summary of these comments shows that some parents feel that the program "as written is fine, but it is not being implemented." Some feel that enrichment options are not being offered in all of the classrooms or, if offered, the options are perceived as "more work" by the students. Some parents feel they do not have enough information on the specific enrichment options offered and do not know how the program is expected to impact on the child.

On the other hand, a group of parents indicated a full understanding and support of the program as it now stands. They feel the regular curriculum at Mellon is excellent and the need for enrichment is not great. Some also indicated that they do not want their child to be singled out in the classroom.

Teachers were asked to indicate the degree they felt the parents understood the mainstream grouping practices of Mellon. Sixty-six percent of the teachers felt the parents at least adequately understood. Five percent were unsure of parents degree of understanding.

Findings. Although **parents generally understand that the GAT program at Mellon is a mainstream program,** many parents do not understand how the program is implemented.

Directions for further study.

1. More clearly define how the GAT program is expected to impact on each child.

2. Define the degree of implementation of the plan that is desired.

3. Communicate to parents the variety of enrichment options offered and information on how the program is implemented in each subject area.

8. Key element. Do parents understand the kinds of instructional objectives included in the curriculum?

Standard of performance. Seventy percent of the parents understand that the GAT program is designed to provide appropriately challenging objectives and activities for GAT students.

Basis for audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents and 50 Mellon teachers.

Note: After preliminary meetings with administrative personnel to discuss the questionnaire draft, the specific parent survey item measuring this key question was changed. The new items were written in an open-ended format which was intended to allow parents a broader response range than the originally written item.

Actual performance. Nineteen GAT parents and 24 Mellon teachers responded to the survey questions.

General parental response to an open-ended question asking for comments on the program designed are presented in List IV and are summarized in key element 7.

On the teacher responses to how will they feel the parents understood that upper level cognitive objectives were included in the curriculum, 58% responded that the parents at least adequately understood the instructional objectives. Eighth grade teachers responses were slightly lower than 7th grade only and teachers of both 7th and eighth grades. The patterns of responses across subject areas showed no differences.

Findings. As stated in the conclusion of key element 7, **parents show an understanding of the mainstream grouping practices at Mellon.** They are aware that the GAT plan is designed to appropriately challenge each child but would like to have more information on how this plan is implemented. **Teachers feel that parents understand that challenging objectives and activities are part of the GAT program,** when appropriate.

Directions for further study.

Identify when, and under what conditions, particular objectives and activities are appropriate.

9. Key element. What is the parents level of satisfaction with the program?

Standard of performance. Seventy percent of the GAT parent population will express satisfaction.

Basis of audit. Survey of 139 GAT parents.

Actual performance. Forty-two out of 139 GAT parents responded to the survey question.

Table XXXV shows the distribution of responses by grade level. Forty-one percent of the parents who responded indicated that they were at least moderately satisfied with the GAT program. This cumulative percentage does not meet the expected criterion of 70%. The mean of 1.47 indicates a response between "mostly dissatisfied" and "moderately satisfied." Across grade levels the relative percentages are basically similar with more 8th grade parents at both extremes.

Findings. More parents are dissatisfied with the implementation of the GAT plan than satisfied.

Direction for further study.

Investigate the areas for study that have been generated as a result of this study.

10. Key element. Are teachers of regular courses providing GAT students with enrichment?

Standard of performance. Ninety percent of the teachers of regular courses will state they are providing enrichment for GAT students.

Basis for audit. Survey of 50 Mellon teachers.

Note: The original key question was amended to specify only those enrichment options available through the Gifted Program Coordinator.

Actual performance. Twenty-five out of 50 Mellon teachers responded to the enrichment question.

Forty percent of the teachers state that they are using the enrichment options offered through the Gifted Program Coordinator. There appears to be no specific pattern of responses across grade levels, subject areas, and years of teaching experience. However, the sample size is too small to reach any definite conclusions on these patterns.

The responses generated on why the enrichment options are not used indicate some miscommunications among the staff. It seems as if a few of the teachers are not clear on what the options are and where they are located. Some teachers felt that the options were to be used by the Coordinator for the students. Other teachers, who seem to be more knowledgeable of the options, prefer to use their own types of enrichment in their classrooms. Some feel the "official" GAT options are perceived as extra work by the students and the students are not particularly motivated to do extra work. Others feel that the teacher generated enrichment is more short term than the options offered from the resource center and better fits the needs of the students.

Regarding the different types of enrichment which are used, the cumulative percentages of responses at "occasionally used" or above (i.e. "frequently", "almost always") show 87% of the teachers using enrichment through differentiation of subject matter, 73% using enrichment through puzzle-solving, 87% using multi-level materials, 23% using enrichment through supplemental activities, and 14% using enrichment through community resources. Across subject areas, math teachers responded 100% that they almost always use puzzle-solving enrichment options. Tables XXXVI through XL the frequency of percentages of responses indicated the extent of use of each type of enrichment.

Findings. **The data indicates that 60% of the teachers are not utilizing the enrichment options offered through the GAT resource center. Enrichment, though, is being provided in many of the classrooms in the form of teacher-made enrichment.** The types of enrichment which are utilized are: differentiation of subject matter, puzzle-solving, and the use of multi-level materials. Supplementary activities such as field trips and co-curricular activities and the use of community resources are rarely used as enrichment. It is interesting to note that these types of enrichment are noticed as missing by the parent group, as indicated in previous answers to key elements.

Directions for further study.

1. Add the teacher-made enrichment options to the collection of GAT resource center options.

2. Devise a standardized method of documenting the enrichment options used by the students.

3. Revise the enrichment options to include more short term projects.

4. Increase the use of supplementary and community resource enrichment used.

5. Investigate the possibility of relieving teachers of extra duties so that they may be available to engage in more co-curricular activities.

11. Key element. To what extent are academic teachers utilizing the service of the Gifted Program Coordinator?

Standard of performance. Fifty percent of the academic teachers have at least one GAT consultation each year with the Gifted Program Coordinator.

Basis of audit. Survey of 50 Mellon teachers; personal interviews with the Gifted Program Coordinator.

Actual Performance. Twenty-one out of 50 Mellon teachers responded. A personal interview was conducted with the Gifted Program Coordinator.

The mean number of times per year that the teachers confer with the Gifted Program Coordinator ranges from 11.9 for teachers for both 7th and 8th graders to 4.0 for the eighth grade only teachers. The standard deviations of the means range from 4.8 to 13.1 indicating a wide dispersion of responses to the question. By subject areas, the means range from 1 to 16.7 and the standard deviations range from 0 to 14.2 (See Table XLI for the complete distribution of means and standard deviations.) On the average, the number of times per year that a teacher confers with the Gifted Program Coordinator is 7.4 with a standard deviation of 9.6. The median of consultations held as it is not affected by the extreme scores as is the mean. The median, in this case is 3.17, indicating that **50% of the teachers have had at least 3 consultations per year with the coordinator.**

Findings. It appears from the data that the frequency of utilization of the services of the Gifted Program Coordinator varies over grade level and subject area. It has been suggested by the teachers that circumstances enabling a greater utilization of the services of the Coordinator would be welcomed.

Directions for further study.

Regarding the role of the Gifted Program Coordinator, it might be wise to increase the amount of time her services are available to the teachers. It may be efficient to add a staff member to assist while allowing the Coordinator to maintain her current administrative functions.

12. Key element. To what extent are the academic teachers utilizing the services of the librarian?

Standard of performance. Fifty percent of the academic teachers have had at least one contact each year with the librarian regarding their GAT students.

Basis for audit. Survey of 50 Mellon teachers. Personal interview with the librarian.

Actual performance. Twenty-three out of 50 Mellon teachers responded. A personal interview was conducted with the librarian.

The mean number of times per year that teachers by grade level confer with the teachers regarding GAT students varied from 1.7 to 4.9. The standard deviations range from 2.0 to 7.0. By subject area, the means range from 0.2 to 7 with standard deviations ranging from 0.45 to 7.9. Table XLII presents the total distribution of means and standard deviations across grade level and subject area.

On the average, across all teachers, the mean number of times per year that the librarian is contacted is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 4.6 the median lies at 2.17 indicating that at least **50% of the staff contact the librarian 2.17 times per year.**

Findings. In parallel with the data on the use of the services of the Gifted Program Coordinator, the data for the Librarian show a wide variety of responses across subject areas and grade levels. The math teachers show the lowest mean and the English teachers' mean is highest. It is difficult to be certain that these data are accurately reflecting the population because of the small response rate.

Directions for further study.

Investigate increasing the amount of time that the librarian could provide to the GAT students as the teachers have suggested. It is possible that the hiring of additional staff to assist the librarian would be beneficial in meeting student and teacher needs.

13. Key element. What is done for the underachieving gifted student?

Standard of performance. Seventy percent of the underachieving students are identified as such on the IEP Supplement and are recommended for appropriate services during the IEP Conference.

Basis for audit. Survey of 139 parents of GAT students. Personal interviews with 9 Mellon teachers.

Note: This question and expected state was later changed to obtain more general information on the underachieving GAT students.

Actual performance. Forty out of 139 GAT parents responded. One hundred percent of the teacher interviewees responded.

Forty-eight percent of the parents of GAT students who responded to the questionnaire feel that their child was an underachieving student. Ten percent of the parents were not sure. (Refer to Table XLIII). A summary of responses on the reasons for believing that the child is underachieving includes:

a) The grades reflect the underachievement.
b) Lack of enthusiasm for school.
c) No motivation to do anything beyond what is required.
d) Grades are good with little effort.
e) Cognitive abilities are not being challenged.

A summary of teacher responses on ways of dealing with teaching underachieving gifted students includes:

a) same as other underachieving students.
b) more is expected of GAT underachieving students.
c) send poor papers home for parents to see.
d) contact Gifted Program Coordinator and ask for suggestions.
f) send home notice.
g) note underachievement on the IEP Supplement.

Findings. Almost half of the parents who responded indicated that they felt their child was an underachieving gifted student. Signs of underachievement are reflected in grades and attitudes which show little motivation on the part of the student. Some parents feel the underachievement is due to a lack of challenge and stimulation in the curriculum.

Teachers deal with their underachieving gifted students in a variety of ways, each reflecting a teacher's own personal philosophy. Many of the teachers interviewed stated that they treated GAT underachievers in the same manner as other underachieving students, encouraging responsibility and independence on the part of the learner.

Directions for further study.

Stimulate discussion on whether or not underachieving gifted students should be treated differently than other underachieving students. If yes, what are the teaching methods which should be used? If no, encourage a sharing of ideas on ways of dealing with underachievement, in general, to promote staff growth and development.

14. Key element. Are teachers of advanced courses expected to provide gifted pupils with enrichment, when appropriate?

Standard of performance. Eighty percent of the administrators and teachers surveyed will respond affirmatively.

Basis for audit. Personal interviews with 4 key GAT administrators at Mellon and 9 Mellon teachers.

Actual performance. One-hundred percent of all interviewees responded to the enrichment question.

All of the teachers interviewed indicated that enrichment options should be provided when appropriate. However, the definition of "appropriate" has not been clearly defined and is interpreted differently by different teachers. Many teachers indicated that the curriculum is challenging and GAT students often do not have time to pursue enrichment options in addition to the regular curriculum.

Administrative responses to this question were varied. In general, administrators felt that, if appropriate, teachers would provide enrichment. However, the curriculum is organized in such a way as to allow little time for enrichment options.

Findings. Teachers and administrators feel that, in general, enrichment is provided in advanced courses when appropriate.

Directions for further study.

Clarify the types of enrichment preferred (i.e. teacher-devised or that originating from the GAT resource center or both) and the conditions of "appropriateness."

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this evaluation effort has provided a wealth of opinions regarding the current implementation of the Gifted and Talented Program at Mellon Junior High School. Parental concerns seemed to be most reactive with a call for more visible evidence of the program's implementation. They have suggested a number of directions for improving the program which include an increase in individualized projects for students, increased parent-teacher communication, and expanded extra-curricular activities. Many parents have also noted a difference in the degree of implementation of the program across subject areas and teachers. While many parents of GAT children agree that Mellon offers an excellent educational program, few of them attribute their child's educational growth and stimulation directly to the Gifted Program.

Teacher concerns were, in general, less strong than parental concerns as many teachers felt that the GAT program is being implemented as designated in the formally written plan. Most of the teachers agreed that in-service sessions on theoretical aspects of teaching the gifted would not be as helpful as in-services designed to address the day-to-day concerns of implementing the GAT plan.

In agreement with parents, teachers felt that a more individualized approach to implementing the plan which could reveal a particular student's strengths and weaknesses would greatly benefit their planning. A revised IEP Supplement could indicate this information and could also serve as a type of progress report to the parents.

In general, teachers felt that the lack of time throughout the day, as well as the unavailability of physical space, has hampered the degree to which they have carried out the plan in their classrooms. Within these restrictions, however, most teachers have found the assistance of the Gifted Program Coordinator invaluable in an attempt to provide for the needs of their gifted students.

In presenting the concerns of both teachers and parents, the needs of the students have been assumed as a top priority. But we must ask ourselves whether this assumption has been tested and to what degree personal interests have emerged as concerns. Indeed many of these students have the potential for great leadership in the future and given a rich, supportive environment may develop into our country's greatest leaders. In fact, a compromise must be made which includes responsibility on the part of the parent, the teacher, and the student to provide an enriched environment at home and at school so that these children may grow and develop to the fullest of their ability.

EVALUATION OF THE STUDY

One of the greatest strengths of the evaluation lies in its research procedures. In the preliminary phases, a proposal was written to identify the stakeholders, methods of obtaining information, data analysis procedures, dissemination plans, and estimated budget. Also, a preliminary questionnaire was sent to the key committee members of the GAT evaluation so that a core of key elements could be chosen for investigation. After resolution on the key element was achieved the surveys for parents and teachers were written. The drafts were submitted to a select group of administrators, teachers, and parents for revision.

While these activities were on-going, the parents and staff of Mellon were being prepared for the upcoming evaluation through memos and public newsletters. Both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered and used to provide an in-depth analysis of the GAT program. Rigid research procedures were utilized in preparing the quantitative data so that accuracy would be maximized. Maintaining anonymity of respondents was also a high priority as that confidentiality could be ensured, hopefully allowing for a free expression of responses. Controls for such factors as gender, grade level, subject area, years experience, and IQ level were woven into the design of the study in an attempt to account for some of the unexplained variance of the responses. As a result of the thoroughness of the evaluation, a substantial amount of information was collected to provide a strong foundation for some formative evaluation recommendations.

One of the most prominent weaknesses of the study is in the small response rate.

Approximately 33% of the parents and 66% of the teachers returned their completed surveys. Although two follow-up mailings were sent the response rate was not significantly increased.

The bias which may exist in the responses is a reality which must be taken into account when making decisions on program changes. It is possible that the views of the parents and teachers who responded were not representative of the entire population. Also, the small return sample limited the kinds of statistical analyses which could be performed across variables of interest. The random selection and 100% participation of the parents and teachers interviewed, however, did serve as a reliability check on the survey data. In general, the responses generated from the surveys were very similar to those generated from the randomly selected interview sample. The fact that the interviews were all conducted by one person is not a strong point, even though the interviewer was an outside participant in the study.

Another weakness of the study lies in the absence of information from the GAT students themselves. Past evaluations, though, have shown a less than acceptable validity of responses when student surveys were administered in the Mt. Lebanon School District.

Table I

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 1: the need to have individual strengths, abilities, and potentials recognized.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	8	32	11	24
2	adequately	9	36	5	11
1	to some extent	5	20	14	30
0	not at all	2	8	10	22
	not sure	1	4	4	9
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			1.95		1.43
Standard Deviation			.95		1.15
Total Number of Responses			25		44
Missing Cases		0	0%	2	4%

Table II

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 2: the need to provide opportunities for leadership.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	4	16	7	15
2	adequately	9	36	9	20
1	to some extent	7	28	5	11
0	not at all	4	16	17	37
	not sure	1	4	5	11
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			1.45		1.16
Standard Deviation			.97		1.20
Total Number of Responses			25		43
Missing Cases		0	0%	3	6%

Table III

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on need 3: the need to explore his/her own abilities.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	7	28	5	11
2	adequately	8	32	7	15
1	to some extent	7	28	12	26
0	not at all	2	8	18	39
	not sure	1	4	2	4.5
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			1.83		.97
Standard Deviation			.96		1.04
Total Number of Responses			25		44
Missing Cases		0	0%	3	4.5%

Table IV

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 4: the need to experience higher levels of cognitive thinking.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	11	44	10	22
2	adequately	6	24	5	11
1	to some extent	6	24	13	28
0	not at all	2	8	13	28
	not sure	0	0	3	7
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			2.04		1.29
Standard Deviation			1.02		1.16
Total Number of Responses			25		44
Missing Cases		0	0%	2	4%

Table V

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 5: the need to provide opportunities for creativity in the visual and performing arts.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	3	12	8	17
2	adequately	3	12	5	11
1	to some extent	3	12	11	24
0	not at all	3	12	16	35
	not sure	4	16	3	6.5
	not applicable	9	36	-	-
Mean Response			1.5		1.12
Standard Deviation			1.16		.183
Total Number of Responses			25		43
Missing Cases		0	0%	3	6.5%

Table VI

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 6: the need to provide a variety of learning experiences.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	9	36	9	20
2	adequately	12	48	9	20
1	to some extent	4	16	11	24
0	not at all	0	0	12	26
	not sure	0	0	2	4
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			2.2		1.36
Standard Deviation			.707		1.13
Total Number of Responses			25		43
Missing Cases		0	0%	3	6%

Table VII

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers responding to need 7: the need to develop social skills appropriate to one's level of maturity.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	5	20	5	11
2	adequately	9	36	6	13
1	to some extent	4	16	10	22
0	not at all	3	12	15	33
	not sure	4	16	6	13
	not applicable	-	-	-	-
Mean Response			1.76		1.02
Standard Deviation			.99		1.08
Total Number of Responses			25		42
Missing Cases		0	0%	4	8%

Table VIII

Percentage of responses at "adequately met" or better range across all needs assessed.

NEEDS	TEACHERS %	PARENTS %
individual strengths	68	35
leadership	52	35
explore abilities	60	26
cognitive thinking	68	33
fine arts	24	11
variety of experiences	84	40
social skills	56	24

Table IX

Percentage of responses at "to some extent" met or better range across all needs assessed.

NEEDS	TEACHERS %	PARENTS %
individual strengths	88	65
leadership	80	46
explore abilities	88	52
cognitive thinking	92	61
fine arts	36 (75)	24
variety of experiences	100	64
social skills	72	46

Table X

Means and standard deviations of responses to need questions.

NEEDS	TEACHERS		PARENTS	
	X	s.d.	X	s.d.
individual strengths	1.95	0.95	1.43	1.15
leadership	1.45	0.97	1.16	1.20
explore abilities	1.83	0.96	.97	1.04
cognitive thinking	2.04	1.02	1.29	1.16
fine arts	1.50	1.16	1.12	0.18
variety of experiences	2.20	0.70	1.36	1.13
social skills	1.76	0.99	1.03	1.10

Table XI

Descriptive statistics of parent and teacher responses to motivation through enrichment in the classroom.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	4	16	6	13
2	adequately	7	28	7	15
1	to some extent	10	40	11	24
0	not at all	3	12	13	28
	not sure	0	0	5	11
	not applicable	0	0	-	-
Mean Response			1.5		1.22
Standard Deviation			.93		1.21
Total Number of Responses			24		42
Missing Cases		1	4%	4	9%

Table XII

Descriptive statistics of parent and teacher responses to motivation through acceleration of course work.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
3	to a great extent	6	24	8	17
2	adequately	8	32	7	15
1	to some extent	8	32	13	28
0	not at all	1	4	10	22
	not sure	1	4	4	9
	not applicable	1	4	-	-
Mean Response			1.82		1.34
Standard Deviation			.88		1.10
Total Number of Responses			25		42
Missing Cases			0%	4	9%

Table XIII

Descriptive statistics of teacher responses to motivation through special groupings within the mainstream.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	%
3	to a great extent	6	24
2	adequately	5	20
1	to some extent	3	12
0	not at all	3	12
	not sure	4	16
	not applicable	3	12
Mean Response			1.826
Standard Deviation			.88
Total Number of Responses			24
Missing Cases		1	4%

Table XIV

Means and standard deviations by parents and teachers on the extent to which certain approaches to learning help to develop motivation for advanced subject matter.

APPROACH	TEACHERS X	s.d.	PARENTS X	s.d
enrichment	1.50	.93	1.22	1.21
acceleration	1.82	.88	1.34	1.10
special groupings	1.83	.88	-	-

Table XV

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.

TEACHERS

	Both 7th and 8th		7th only		8th only		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No	0	0	1	13	2	29	3	13
Yes	8	100	7	87	5	71	20	87

Number of responses 23

Missing 2

Table XVI

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by subject area on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.

TEACHERS

	English		Communications		Math		Social Studies		Science		Foreign Language	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No	1	25	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	50
Yes	3	75	3	100	4	80	4	100	3	100	1	50

Number of responses 21

Missing 4

Table XVII

Number and percentages of teacher responses by years of experience on whether they have sufficient information on teaching of the gifted.

TEACHERS

	1 - 3 years f	%	4 - 10 years f	%	over 10 years f	%
No	0	-	0	0	3	14
Yes	0	-	2	100	19	86
Number responses	24					
Missing cases	1					

Table XVIII

Numbers and percentage of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of guiding students to pursue appropriate course objectives.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS 7th only f	%	8th only f	%	Total f	%
3	to a great extent	2	25	1	14	7	29
2	adequately	2	25	3	43	9	38
1	to some extent	3	38	3	43	7	29
0	not at all	1	12	0	0	1	4
Total Number of Responses		8		7		24	
Missing		0		0		1	

Table XIX

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of evaluating student accomplishment.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS 7th only f	%	8th only f	%	Total f	%
3	to a great extent	1	12	3	43	9	38
2	adequately	3	38	2	28.5	8	33
1	to some extent	4	50	2	28.5	7	29
0	not at all	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Responses		8		7		24	
Missing		0				1	

Table XX

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses by grade level on extent able to carry out responsibility of counseling students regarding course selection for the coming year.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS 7th only f	%	8th only f	%	Total f	%
3	to a great extent	2	50	3	43	8	42
2	adequately	2	50	3	43	9	47
1	to some extent	0	0	1	14	2	11
0	not at all	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Responses		4		7		19	
Missing		4		0		6	

Table XXI

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement on providing information on a child's overall, present level of performance.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
4	extremely useful	2	8	4	9
3	greatly useful	5	20	8	17
2	moderately useful	7	28	7	15
1	slightly useful	8	32	6	13
0	not at all useful	1	4	5	11
	not applicable	1	4	-	-
	not sure	1	4	6	13
Mean Response			1.96		2.00
Standard Deviation			1.07		1.31
Total Number of Responses			25		36
Missing Cases		0	0%	10	22

Table XXII

Descriptive statistics of parents on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the depth of understanding of subject matter being studied.

CODE	RESPONSE	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
4	extremely useful	3	7
3	greatly useful	7	15
2	moderately useful	8	17
1	slightly useful	3	6
0	not at all useful	9	20
	not sure	6	13
Mean Response			1.73
Standard Deviation			1.39
Total Number of Responses			36
Missing		10	22%

Table XXIII

Descriptive statistics of parents on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the level of involvement in classroom activities.

CODE	RESPONSE	PARENTS f	%
4	extremely useful	3	7
3	greatly useful	5	10
2	moderately useful	11	24
1	slightly useful	3	7
0	not at all useful	8	17
	not sure	6	13
Mean Response			1.73
Standard Deviation			1.31
Total Number of Responses			36
Missing		10	22%

Table XXIV

Desriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the appropriateness of learning goals.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	%	PARENTS f	%
4	extremely useful	-	-	2	4
3	greatly useful	7	28	7	15
2	moderately useful	7	28	6	13
1	slightly useful	7	28	8	18
0	not at all useful	2	8	6	13
	not applicable	1	4	-	-
	not sure	1	4	7	15
Mean Response			1.83		1.69
Standard Deviation			.98		1.26
Total Number of Responses			25		36
Missing		0	0%	10	22%

Table XXV

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the appropriateness of learning objectives

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
4	extremely useful	-	-	2	4
3	to a great extent	7	28	6	13
2	adequately	7	28	7	15
1	to some extent	7	28	8	18
0	not at all	2	8	6	13
	not sure	1	4	-	-
	not applicable	1	4	7	15
Mean Response			1.83		1.66
Standard Deviation			.98		1.23
Total Number of Responses			25		36
Missing		0	0%	10	22%

Table XXVI

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement in providing information on the method of evaluating a child's work.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	TEACHERS %	PARENTS f	PARENTS %
4	extremely useful	1	4	4	9
3	greatly useful	4	16	6	13
2	moderately useful	8	32	7	15
1	slightly useful	7	28	3	6
0	not at all useful	3	12	10	22
	not applicable	1	4		
	not sure	1	4	6	13
Mean Response			1.69		1.70
Standard Deviation			1.06		1.47
Total Number of Responses			25		36
Missing		0	0%	10	22%

Table XXVII

Descriptive statistics of teachers on the usefulness of the IEP Supplement for providing information on expected outcomes.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	%
4	extremely useful	1	4
3	greatly useful	4	16
2	moderately useful	8	32
1	slightly useful	8	32
0	not at all useful	2	8
	not applicable	1	4
	not sure	1	4
Mean Response			1.74
Standard Deviation			1.01
Total Number of Responses			25
Missing			0%

Table XXVIII

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the overall usefulness of the IEP Supplement.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS f	%	PARENTS f	%
4	extremely useful	1	4	3	7
3	greatly useful	6	24	7	15
2	moderately useful	5	20	8	17
1	slightly useful	8	32	6	13
0	not at all useful	3	12	8	17
	not applicable	1	4	-	-
	not sure	1	4	5	11
Mean Response			1.73		1.72
Standard Deviation			1.14		1.33
Total Number of Responses			25		37
Missing Cases		0	0%	9	20%

Table XXIX

Cumulative percentages of parents and teachers responding at the "moderately useful" or better level on the IEP Supplement aspects.

IEP aspects	TEACHERS %	PARENTS %
present performance	56%	63%
depth of understanding	-	60%
involvement	-	64%
goals	56%	52%
objectives	56%	52%
method of evaluating	52%	56%
expected outcomes	52%	-
overall usefulness	48%	56%

Table XXX

Cumulative percentages of parents and teachers responding at the "slightly useful" or better level on the IEP Supplement aspects.

IEP aspects	TEACHERS cumulative %	PARENTS cumulative %
present performance	88%	83%
depth of understanding	-	70%
involvement	-	74%
goals	84%	80%
objectives	84%	79%
method of evaluating	80%	66%
expected outcomes	84%	-
overall usefulness	80%	75%

Table XXXI

Means and standard deviations for parents and teachers on IEP Supplement aspects evaluated.

IEP Supplement aspects	TEACHERS		PARENTS	
	x	sd	x	sd
present performance	1.96	1.07	2.0	1.31
depth of understanding	-	-	1.73	1.39
involvement	-	-	1.73	1.31
goals	1.83	.98	1.69	1.26
objectives	1.83	.98	1.66	1.23
method of evaluating	1.69	1.06	1.70	1.47
expected outcomes	1.74	1.01		
overall usefulness	1.73	1.14	1.72	1.33

Table XXXII

Descriptive statistics of parents and teachers on the usefulness of the regular system of reporting on pupil progress in providing adequate information on a child's progress in the GAT program.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS		PARENTS	
		f	%	f	%
3	extremely useful	4	16	7	15
2	greatly useful	5	20	3	7
1	moderately useful	4	16	10	22
0	slightly useful	7	28	5	11
	not at all useful	1	4	18	39
	not applicable	1	4	-	-
	not sure	1	4	2	4
Mean Response			2.19		1.44
Standard Deviation			1.8		1.50
Total Number of Responses			23		45
Missing Cases		2	8%	1	2%

Table XXXIII

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses to whether the IEP Supplement is an effective tool for communicating a student's expected level of performance to his/her parents.

Responses by Grade Level:

	TEACHERS Total	
No	6	24
Yes	15	60
Missing Cases	4	16

Table XXXIV

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the extent they feel parents of GAT students understand that upper cognitive level objectives are included in curriculum guides.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS Total f	%
3	to a great extent	6	24
2	adequately	5	20
1	to some extent	7	28
0	not at all	1	4
	not sure	5	20
	not applicable	-	-
Total Number of Responses			24
Missing Cases		1	4%

Table XXXV

Descriptive statistics on parent responses by grade level on the overall level of satisfaction with the GAT program.

CODE	RESPONSE	PARENTS 7th f	7th %	8th f	8th %	Total f	Total %
4	very satisfied	1	6	3	13	4	9
3	mostly satisfied	2	13	3	13	4	9
2	moderately satisfied	4	25	1	5	6	13
1	mostly dissatisfied	5	31	8	37	13	28
0	very dissatisfied	4	25	7	32	12	26

Mean Response	1.47
Standard Deviation	1.33
Total Number of Responses	42
Missing Cases	4 9%

Table XXXVI

Numbers and percentages of teacher on the use of enrichment through differentation of subject matter.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS Total f	Total %
4	almost always	2	13
3	frequently	4	27
2	occasionally	7	47
1	rarely	2	13
0	almost never	0	0
	not applicable	-	-

Table XXXVII

Numbers and percentages of teachers on use of enrichment through complicated puzzle solving.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS	
		Total	
		f	%
4	almost always	3	20
3	frequently	3	20
2	occasionally	5	33
1	rarely	3	20
0	almost never	1	76
	not applicable	-	-

Table XXXVIII

Numbers and percentages of teachers on use of enrichment through supplemental multi-level instructional materials.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS	
		Total	
		f	%
4	almost always	1	7
3	frequently	8	53
2	occasionally	4	27
1	rarely	2	13
0	almost never	0	0
	not applicable	-	-

Table XXXIX

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the use of enrichment through supplemental activities (i.e. field trips, co-curricular interest groups)

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS	
		Total	
		f	%
4	almost always	0	0
3	frequently	1	8
2	occasionally	2	15
1	rarely	3	23
0	almost never	4	54
	not applicable	-	-

Table XL

Numbers and percentages of teacher responses on the use of enrichment through community resources.

CODE	RESPONSE	TEACHERS	
		Total	
		f	%
4	almost always	0	0
3	frequently	0	0
2	occasionally	2	14
1	rarely	4	29
0	almost never	8	57
	not applicable		

Table XLI

Means and standard deviations on the number of times per year teacher by grade level and subject area confer with the Gifted Program Coordinator.

TEACHERS

Grade level	Consultations/year x	sd	n
7 only	5.3	6.6	7
8 only	4.0	4.8	6
Both 7th and 8th	11.9	13.1	8
Subject Area	x	sd	n
English	10.4	14.2	5
Communications	13	17	3
Math	2.8	2.6	5
Social Studies	16.7	5.8	3
Science	1.7	1.5	3
Foreign Language	1	0	2
Total	7.4	9.6	21

Table XLII

Means and standard deviations on the number of times per year teaching by grade level and subject area confer with the librarian.

TEACHERS

Grade level	Consultations/year x	sd	n
7 only	5.3	6.6	7
8 only	4.0	4.8	6
Both 7th and 8th	11.9	13.1	8
Subject Area	x	sd	n
English	10.4	14.2	5
Communications	13	17	3
Math	2.8	2.6	5
Social Studies	16.7	5.8	3
Science	1.7	1.5	3
Foreign Language	1	0	2
Total	7.4	9.6	21

Table XLIII

Numbers and percentages of parents responding to whether child is an underachieving student.

PARENTS

	7th		8th		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No	8	44	9	41	17	42
Yes	8	44	11	50	19	48
Not sure	2	12	2	9	4	10

Table XLIV

Numbers and percentages of parents attending an IEP conference at Mellon Junior High School.

PARENTS

	7th		8th		Total	
RESPONSE	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	14	73	17	81	31	78
No	5	27	4	19	9	22
Total Responses	19		21		40	

Table XLV

Numbers and percentages of parents responding by grade level on whether they have sufficient information on their legal rights as parents of GAT students.

PARENTS

	7th		8th		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	10	62	19	86	30	77
No	6	38	3	14	9	23
Total Number Responses		39				
Missing Cases		7				

Table XLVI

Numbers and percentages of GAT students by grade level selecting advanced math courses.

STUDENTS

	7th		8th		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
MATH						
Yes	16	79	20	91	36	86
No	4	21	2	9	6	14
Total number of responses			42			
Missing cases			4			

Table XLVII

Number and percentage of GAT students selecting foreign language courses.

PARENTS

	7th		8th		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
FOREIGN LANGUAGE						
Yes	18	90	20	91	38	91
No	2	10	2	9	4	9
Total number of responses			42			
Missing cases			4			

LIST I

Parental thoughts and suggestions on how to improve the GAT program for those needs which are not being adequately met.

1. Develop more individual projects.
2. Have less rigidity in curriculum.
3. Allow students more time to explore the basic subject material he/she has learned.
4. Do more ability grouping in academic subject areas.
5. Develop more interesting enrichment subject material. Allowing for greater selection of course options on the part of the student. More interesting topics might help to develop motivation in students. Specific suggestions include: more computers, newsletters, debates, radio program, honors band, honors chorus.
6. Have more direct contact with parents by teachers through the use of progress reports and better descriptions of available enrichment options.
7. Have GAT students lead class activities.
8. Expand extra-curricular activity program for GAT students; send a list of these activities home for parents to see.
9. Organize more field trips to museums, symphony, etc.
10. Increase visibility and accessibility of guidance counselor.

LIST II

A summary of additional comments to the interview question in which teachers were asked if they thought there was a difference between the written GAT program and its actual implementation.

1. The plan could be implemented to a fuller extent if more work space were available for the students.
2. The asterisk objectives for higher level learning are carried out in the classroom. The use of these objectives constitutes implementation of the GAT program.
3. Many short-range teacher devised enrichment options are used in addition to the activities from the GAT resource center which tend to be long-ranged.
4. Much of the present curricula is excellent and does not require special enrichment options.
5. Some of the programs are fast-paced and demanding for all students.
6. Some students do not choose enrichment options.

LIST III

Comments on ways to increase the utility of the IEP Supplement.

I. Teacher Comments

1. Need to see a continuum of performance, area by area, from the time a student enters the GAT program.
2. Include a skill checklist per subject area.
3. Include teacher comments on observations of child's performance.
4. It's too time-consuming; have someone besides the teacher who is currently teaching complete it.
5. IEP Supplement should include statements written by the students on his/her particular goals, attitudes, interests. These statements should be updated each year.

II. Parent comments

1. Increase the amount of detailed information provided noting that this would be time-consuming to teachers.
2. Send a form to parents so that they can indicate which teachers they would like to see at a special mid-semester conference.
3. Include suggestions on how parents could help support and encourage children.
4. Provide progress reports every term.
5. Use a narrative instead of multiple-choice responses.
6. Indicate a child's strengths and weaknesses.
7. Provide the report to the parents early enough to allow suggestions for improvement.
8. Make form more applicable to specific content areas.
9. Some parents responded that they had never seen or heard of an IEP Supplement.

LIST IV

Parental comments on program design.

1. The program does not stimulate the students.
2. The program is not being implemented.
3. The program has been explained in detail and we are supportive.
4. I do not know how the program specifically impacts upon my child.
5. The elementary level program is superior.
6. No program is offered outside of the regular program.
7. No additional projects are done.
8. I approve of the design enrichment if done when appropriate.
9. The individual teachers don't evaluate what they are doing for the GAT child.
10. Enrichment is more work. Freedom of choice should be allowed more frequently by child in terms of selecting enrichment options.
11. I have no information on how individual teachers are implementing the program in their classroom.
12. Philosophy and theory are fine; implementation is absent.
13. Little incentives are offered to excel. Very little attention to specific gifts and/or talents.
14. GAT students belong to a program but do not have the opportunity to function as a group.

LIST V

Summary of responses on why teachers are <u>not</u> using the enrichment options provided through the GAT resource center.

1. They provide their own activities and materials appropriate for the gifted in their class.
2. The course objectives take care of the GAT options.
3. They are not aware of the interactions between the student and the coordinator.
4. They do not have enough time to work directly with the coordinator.
5. The students view these options as extra work.
6. The students aren't self-motivated enough to use the materials even though they have been presented and explained.
7. They (the students) are in an advanced math class.
8. The students have trouble keeping up with the regular work.
9. Sometimes the options are effective only if used for extra credit.

LIST VI

Parental comments on ways to improve the GAT program.

1. Teachers should be very knowledgeable in their subject area.
2. Consult the child on curriculum enrichment.
3. Increase communication with the parents; communication should not be for problems only.
4. Acceleration is needed in all subject areas.
5. Give pretests to help individualize work.
6. Have special field trips for GAT students.
7. Make the program more visible.
8. Provide advanced courses in English and science.
9. Provide computer enrichment courses.
10. Ensure that all teachers are aware of who are the GAT students.
11. Teachers should meet with GAT students individually and privately.
12. Eliminate it.
13. Organize meetings with teachers instead of GAT Coordinator.
14. Schedule conferences twice a year.
15. Increase extra-curricular activities.
16. Assign specific semester-long projects for students.
17. Organize a support group of parents and teachers.
18. Develop IEP's for each child.
19. Send progress report on GAT performance.
20. Install more telephone lines, GAT coordinator line is often busy.
21. More consideration should be taken into account of the great physical and psychological changes occurring in the junior high adolescent.
22. Develop the program so that it is equally strong across all subject areas.
23. Increase flexibility and creativity in the classroom.

LIST VII

Teacher comments on how to improve the GAT program in academic areas.

* 1. Add an advanced English course in both 7th and 8th grades.
2. Rescreen GAT students; remove low achieving students.
3. Identify special talents and interests of GAT students.
4. Increase communication to teachers on available enrichment options.
5. Increase interaction between GAT students and the coordinator.
6. Set up a committee to periodically discuss the program. Have subject department representation.
7. Add microcomputers to math labs.
8. Add a foreign language laboratory.

Teacher comments on how to improve the GAT program in terms of arranging for time to spend with the students

* 1. Increase availability of the GAT Coordinator so that she may work more frequently with the students.
2. Hire a few more teachers specifically for teaching GAT students.
* 3. Smaller classes.
4. Team teaching and the use of aides.
5. More extra curricular activities.
6. Organize an activities period every other Friday with a wide-range of student options.

Teacher comments on how to improve the GAT program in terms of arranging for extra space in which students may work.

* 1. establish a separate resource room for supervised small group work.

* Response indicated very strongly among teachers.

APPENDICES

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM EVALUATION

MELLON ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW

1. Do you think there are differences between the GAT program as it is formally written and its actual implementation?

(POSSIBLE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS)

(a) Why do you think the differences exist?

(b) Do they create problems. What kinds?

(c) How would the problems be alleviated?

2. Do you think that the Mellon GAT program generally meets the needs of the gifted students?

3. Are there any particular groups of students whose needs may not be met as well as others? (i.e. underachievers, IQ levels, etc.)

4. What kinds of concerns do you hear from the parents of the gifted students?

(ALSO)

(a) Are the concerns different for parents of 7th and 8th grade students?

(b) What kinds of concerns do you hear from the teachers?

6. Do you feel that the staff has sufficient information about the needs of the gifted students?

7. Are the teachers of advanced courses such as math and foreign language expected to provide gifted pupils with enrichment, when appropriate?

If yes, when is it appropriate?

If no, why not?

7. What kinds of changes could be implemented?

(AREAS FOR SUGGESTIONS)

(a) more space for the students to work

(b) more time for teachers to spend with the GAT students

(c) rearrange schedules for teachers

(d) additional staff

(e) additional 'report card' for GAT students

8. In what ways are the teachers utilizing your services?

(IF APPROPRIATE)

On the average, how often per year are these services performed for each teacher?

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM EVALUATION

MELLON PARENT INTERVIEW

CLASSIFICATION: _____

GENDER: _____

GRADE LEVEL: _____

1. What are your major concerns about the GAT program at Mellon?

2. Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the program?

(OTHER AREAS TO PROBE, IF NECESSARY)

(a) the IEP Supplement? How helpful is the current form?

(b) the IEP conferences? How helpful are these?

(c) possible courses to be added in the academic areas?

(d) information needs of transfer students?

(e) stimulating motivation for advanced subject matter?

4. What suggestions do you have for improving communication between you and the school on your child's progress in the GAT program?

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM EVALUATION

MELLON TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. Do you think there are differences between the GAT program as it is formally written and its actual implementation?

(POSSIBLE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS)

(a) Why do you think the differences exist?

(b) Do they create problems? What kinds?

(c) How could the problems be alleviated?

2. Is there a difference in the 7th and 8th grade implementation of the plan?

3. How do you deal with underachieving GAT students in your classrooms?

(PROBING AREAS)

(a) Should this underachievement be noted on the student's IEP Supplement?

(b) During the IEP conference, are special recommendations made which take this underachievement into account?

4. Do there need to be any changes on the IEP Supplement in order to make it more useful to you?

5. What suggestions do you have for improving comunication between you and the parents on your student's progress in the GAT program?

6. What kinds of information needs do you have regarding the teaching of the gifted?

MELLON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM EVALUATION

Parent Survey

Please respond to each question by referring to your child (or children) who is/are participating in the Gifted and Talented Program (GAT) at Mellon Junior High School.

1. In your understanding, the GAT program at Mellon attempts to meet the needs of gifted and talented students by:

   (Check One)

   ___ a) providing enrichment and acceleration of curriculum in the regular classroom.

   ___ b) providing enrichment and acceleration of curriculum in a separate classroom composed only of those students formally identified as gifted and/or talented.

   ___ c) not sure

Do you have any comments on the program's design, as you understand it? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Use the scale below to indicate your response to items 3, 4, 5, and 6:

0 - not at all
1 - to a little extent
2 - adequately
3 - to a great extent
4 - completely
NS - not sure

Place a check ( ) in the block under the number of the response which most nearly describes your opinion.

2. To what extent are the following needs of your child/children being met by Mellon's GAT program:

	0	1	2	3	4	NS
a) the need to have individual strengths, abilities and potentials recognized						
b) the need to provide opportunities for leadership						
c) the need to explore his/her own abilities						
d) the need to experience higher levels of cognitive thinking						
e) the need to provide opportunities for creativity in the visual and performing arts						
f) the need to provide for a variety of learning experiences						
g) the need to develop appropriate social skills for his/her level of maturity						

3. For those needs which you feel are not being adequately met, do you have any suggestions for improvement? _____

4. Some of the academic programs at Mellon provide students an opportunity for enrichment of subject material. To what extent do these enrichment opportunities help your child/children develop motivation to learn advanced subject matter? _____

5. Some academic programs allow students to proceed through course work at a pace corresponding to their own abilities. To what extent does this opportunity for acceleration help your child develop the readiness and willingness to learn advanced subject matter? _____

6. What is your child's/children's current grade level? (Check one for each child participating in the GAT program at Mellon.)

Child 1	Child 2 (if applicable)	Child 3 (if applicable)
___ 7th grade	___ 7th grade	___ 8th grade
___ 8th grade	___ 8th grade	___ 8th grade

7. Check if he/she is currently taking:

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3
a) advanced math?	_____	_____	_____
b) a foreign language?	_____	_____	_____

8. Have you or your spouse ever attended an IEP conference at Mellon Junior High School? ___ no ___ yes
If yes, please comment on its utility. _____

_____

_____

Use the following scale to indicate your response to the items 9 and 10.

0 = not at all useful
1 = slightly useful
2 = moderately useful
3 = greatly useful
4 = extremely useful
NS = not sure

9. How useful is the IEP Supplement in providing information about your child/children in the following areas:

	0	1	2	3	4	NS
a) overall level of performance						
b) depth of understanding of subject matter being studied						
c) level of involvement in classroom activities						
d) appropriateness of learning goals						
e) appropriateness of learning objectives						
f) method by which your child's coursework is evaluated						
How would you rate the overall usefulness of the IEP Supplement?						

Can you suggest any ideas to increase its utility? _____

_____

0 1 2 3 4 NS

10. How useful is the regular system of reporting on pupil progress (i.e., report cards, home notices parent/teacher conferences) in providing you with adequate information on your child's/children's progress in the GAT program? _____

11. Do you feel that your child is an underachieving gifted student?

____ not sure
____ no
____ yes
In what way? _____

_____

_____

12. In general, what is your overall level of satisfaction with the GAT program at Mellon Junior High School?

___ a) very satisfied
___ b) mostly satisfied
___ c) moderately satisfied
___ d) mostly dissatisfied
___ e) very dissatisfied

13. Do you have any thoughts on how the program could be improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Is the program equally strong across all subject areas? _____

_____

_____

_____

15. Do you have sufficient information about your legal rights as the parents of a gifted student? ____ yes ____ no

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION. PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

MELLON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM EVALUATION

TEACHER SURVEY

Check the subject area you are currently teaching.

___	a)	English	___	f)	Art
___	b)	Mathematics	___	g)	Music
___	c)	Science	___	h)	Foreign Language
___	d)	Social Studies	___	i)	Other (Specify) _____
___	e)	Communications			

Grade level ___ 7th ___ 8th ___ both 7th and 8th

Total number of years teaching?

___ a) 1-3 years
___ b) 4-10 years
___ c) more than 10 years

Please respond to each question by referring to the children in your classroom who are participating in the GAT program at Mellon. If there are currently no such children in your classes, please answer the questions using your general knowledge of the program, but check the box below. Every teacher's input is considered valuable.

___ I currently do not have any GAT students in my classes.

Use the scale below to respond to items 1, 2, 3, and 4:

0 = not at all
1 = to some extent
2 = adequately
3 = to a great extent
NS = not sure
NA = not applicable

Place a check ( ) in the block under the number of the response which most nearly describes your opinion.

1. In your opinion, to what extent do the parents of GAT students understand:

	0	1	2	3	NS	NA
a) the mainstream grouping practices of the junior high school						
b) that upper cognitive level objectives are included in the curriculum guides						

2. To what extent do the following approaches help GAT students develop motivation to study advanced subject material:

	0	1	2	3	NS	NA
a) enrichment in the regular classroom						
b) acceleration of course work						
c) special groupings within the mainstream						

3. To what extent are the following needs of your students actually being met by Mellon's GAT program:

	0	1	2	3	NS	NA
a) the need to have individual strengths abilities and potentials recognized						
b) the need to provide opportunities for leadership						
c) the need to explore their own abilities						
d) the need to experience higher levels of cognitive thinking						
e) the need to provide opportunities for creativity in the visual and performing arts						
f) the need to provide a variety of learning experiences						
g) the need to develop social skills appropriate to one's level of maturity						
h) other (specify) _____ _____						

4. To what extent are you able to carry out these key GAT responsibilities in your classroom:

	0	1	2	3	NS	NA
a) guiding GAT students to pursue course objectives appropriate to their ability.						
b) evaluating student accomplishment of those objectives.						
c) counseling students regarding course selection for the coming year.						

5. Do you feel that you have sufficient information about the plan and the education of gifted children to permit you to provide for the needs of gifted students?

___ yes ___ no

6. What kinds of information have been most helpful?

_____

_____

_____

7. What additional kinds of information would you like to have provided?

_____

_____

_____

Use the scale below to respond to items 8, 9 and 12.

0	=	not at all useful
1	=	slightly useful
2	=	moderately useful
3	=	greatly useful
4	=	extremely useful
NS	=	not sure

8. How useful are the <u>IEP Supplements</u> in providing information about:

	0	1	2	3	4	NS
a) a student's present level of performance						
b) appropriate goals						
c) appropriate objectives						
d) the basis for evaluating						
e) the expected outcomes						

9. How would you rate the overall usefulness of the IEP Supplement? 0 1 2 3 4 NS

10. Can you suggest any ideas to increase its usefulness?

11. Is the IEP Supplement an effective tool for use in communicating a student's expected level of performance to his/her parents? ___ yes ___ no

12. In general, how useful is the regular system of reporting on pupil progress (i.e., home notices, report cards, parent-teacher conferences) in providing parents with information of their child's progress in the GAT program?

13. Are the GAT students in your classroom using the GAT enrichment options which are available through the Gifted Program Coordinator?

___ a) yes

___ b) no (Why not?)

If no, skip to question 15.
If yes, please answer question 14.

Use the scale below to indicate your response to question 14.

0 = almost never
1 = rarely
2 = occasionally
3 = frequently
4 = almost always
NA = not applicable

14. How often are the following types of enrichment used by your students: 0 1 2 3 4 NA

a) enrichment through differentiation of subject matter?

b) enrichment through complicated problem and puzzle solving?

c) enrichment through the use of supplemental, multi-level instructional materials?

0 1 2 3 4 NA

d) enrichment through the use of supplemental activities (i.e. field trips, co-curricular interest groups)? _____

e) enrichment through the use of community resources? _____

15. On the average, how many times per year do you confer with the Gifted Program Coordinator? _____ times/year

16. Aproximately how many times per year do you confer with the librarian regarding your GAT students? _____ times/year

17. Do you have any thoughts on how the GAT program could be improved in the academic areas? _____

in terms of arranging for time to spend with the students? _____

in terms of arranging for extra space in which the students may work? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION. PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SEALED ENVELOPE TO BEV SPROWLS.

A PERSPECTIVE OF OUR SCHOOLS

The Mt. Lebanon School District, 7 Horsman Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228 is located six miles south of the city.

Mt. Lebanon is a community, six square miles in size, with a population of 34,414 (1980 Census).

Our Schools and Their Organization

In 1984-85 the school system operated seven elementary schools, one junior high and one senior high. All schools are located in areas which permit all, except the exceptional children to walk to school.

The enrollment in September 1984 was 5,138: 2,181 elementary, 791 junior high and 2,166 senior high.

The structure of the schools is K-6, 7-8 and 9-12.

Our Staff

The school staff includes 316 certificated classroom teachers with an average salary in 1984-85 of $29,426.

The support services staff of nurses, social worker, counselors, librarians and psychologists numbers 27.5.

276 teachers hold Masters Degrees or better including 5 Doctorates.

The total pupil-staff ratio exclusive of administrators in 1984-85 is 14.9:1.

Our Budget

The nine member elected school board annually sets the tax millage as the budget is approved. The 1984-85 budget of $25,366,029 carries a per pupil expenditure of $4,937.

The Students

Average class sizes were:

Kindergarten	21
Grades 1-6	22

and at the secondary level:

	Junior high	Senior high
Business education	0	28
Foreign language	30	22
Mathematics	25	24
Science	26	23
Fine arts (excluding vocal/instrumental groups)	22	21
Social studies	26	23
Industrial arts	18	19
English	26	21
Computer science	15	23
Home economics	18	17
Instrumental/vocal music	47	27
Health	26	28

The 1984 graduating class of 542 saw 71% go on to 4-year colleges, 6.1% go on to 2-year colleges and an additional 6.8% go on to business, technical or specialized schools for a total 83.9% continuing their education.

The class included 12 National Merit semi-finalists and 18 commended students.

SAT scores of the graduating class averaged 467 verbal, 509 math.

The Program

The schools offer a solid academic program of instruction. Grouping practices begin in the elementary grades and provide for acceleration and enrichment. Secondary courses provide similar opportunities. Libraries in every school are staffed with fulltime certificated librarians.

Fine Arts programs are taught K-12 by specialists. Fine Arts opportunities at the secondary level are broad in scope and housed in a separate facility.

Physical Education classes are complemented by interscholastic and intramural programs.

The Science curriculum begins in first grade and embraces biology, chemistry and physics at the secondary level. A planetarium program is offered in grades 1-12.

Foreign language courses begin in seventh grade in French, Spanish and German.

Practical Arts programs include the industrial arts areas - electronics, graphics, drawing, machine and power mechanics - as well as business department courses and home economics courses.

Advanced placement courses are offered in English, math, science, history, computer science and languages.

Pupil Personnel Services encompasses all grades and provides pupil services programs at the elementary schools, educational guidance, speech and language correction, psychological testing and evaluation and consultation at all grade levels.

A mainstream program for gifted students is offered. The plan includes opportunities to experience higher levels of content and cognitive thinking through enrichment, acceleration and/or special groupings.

Alternatives are available for students who are identified as exceptional. Provisions are made at all levels for children with learning disabilities, learning and behavior problems, and the educably mentally handicapped. Classes operated by the Allegheny Intermediate Unit are also available within the district for hearing and visually handicapped children. Other placement opportunities are made available in schools for the mentally and physically handicapped under the direction of the Intermediate Unit.

The secondary student is also served by vocational and technical programs at Parkway West Vocational School.

Summary of Required Content of Individual Education Program

The planning process and the school program fulfill the intents of the state mandate in the following manner:

MANDATE	FULFILLMENT
I. Statement of Students' Present Level of Educational Performance	The Student Profile Report summarizes test results, achievement and other data. Teachers and counselors have reviewed available data to assess the pupil's present level of performance in a specific subject area. The Secondary GAT I.E.P. Supplement is completed by the subject area teacher to reflect an updated statement of the student's performance each year.
II. Statement of Annual Goals	The course offering books and subject area curriculum guides, written by the teachers of each course, and the secondary GAT-I.E.P. Supplement (part II) provide the overall goals. The school district document titled "Providing for the Gifted" (pages 6-) indicates appropriate instructional goals for gifted and talented students. The combination of these sources constitutes the annual goals for each student. Copies may be borrowed for review from the Director of Secondary Education, Subject Area Coordinators and teacher.
III. Short Term Instructional Objectives and Activities	All curriculum guides identify objectives, content, and activities or processes to be used in the course. Objectives suitable to exceptional students are indicated; as the school year progresses, teachers will identify objectives suited to the students' abilities.
IV. Statement of Specific Educational Services Needed by the Student	Appropriate personnel assess special services needed by the student in areas of special education including speech, reading, hearing, vision, physical education, etc. List applicable services: _____
V. Participation in regular education programs	The student will participate full time in the regular education program which includes a variety of optional activities. See Appendix A, Junior High School and Appendix B, Senior High School.
VI. Duration of Individualized Education Program	Duration of the I.E.P. in the primary assignment is for one school year.
VII. Evaluative Procedures and Criteria	Appropriate evaluative criteria and procedures are listed in curriculum guides. Teachers will indicate expected level of performance in each of five major subject areas on the I.E.P. Supplement. Teachers will report student performance at nine-week intervals and may utilize home notices as interim reports.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: See attached course selection form for details.

MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT
7 HORSMAN DRIVE
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15228

THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

At the junior high school, the program for gifted and talented students is realized by a tracked program providing enrichment and acceleration in mathematics and by individualized study, projects and differentiated assignments provided by the professional staff in the various curriculum areas.

Classroom teachers may augment their provisions for GAT students by utilizing the services of the Gifted Program Coordinator and the librarian. Teachers may replace a student's previously mastered skill with curriculum-extending enrichment options developed by the Gifted Program Coordinator and the librarian. The student may work in the library, the resource room, or the classroom, depending upon the nature of the enrichment option and the time available. Some of these options are effectively used in the classroom by students who complete their classwork at a much faster pace then their classmates.

Special opportunities are also available in student election of foreign language, art enrichment, band, chorus, orchestra, and extra-curricular activities.

(1) Enrichment Provisions

(a) Enrichment through differentiation

In library or project-oriented assignments, the student:

- works with more challenging topics or projects;
- uses a wider range of resource materials;
- uses more sophisticated resoure materials; and
- shows analysis, synthesis, and, in some subject areas, evaluation. (See Bloom's Taxonomy)

(b) Enrichment through problem solving

The student deals with more complicated problems and puzzles which challenge his her:

- background concepts;
- current manipulative abilities (mathematics);
- ability to select appropriate concepts and processes;
- reasoning ability to logically synthesize; and
- ability to evaluate results

(c) Enrichment through multi-level instructional materials

The student uses supplemental books and printed materials which provide for:.

- reading at a higher level;
- the investigation of a wider range of related materials; and
- a more detailed pursuit of topics of interest.

The student uses supplemental non-print materials (AV materials, laboratory materials, and practical arts materials) to provide for:

- the investigation of a wider range of related materials; and
- a more detailed pursuit of topics of interest.

The student will use games that may:
- stimulate acquisition and use of knowledge;
- encourage the broadening of concepts; and
- require research for role-playing.

(d) Enrichment through community resources
The student may use community resources for investigating topics related to classroom activities.

(e) Enrichment by student option
Although the following courses are open to all students, additional enrichment activities will be provided for the gifted and talented student within the individual program of studies:
- Art
- Music (Band, Chorus, Orchestra)
- Foreign Language (French, German, Spanish)

(f) Enrichment through supplemental academic options
- Field trips
- Co-curricular interest groups
- Reading resource rooms
- Libraries

(2) Acceleration Provisions
(a) Mathematics
(b) Early entry into foreign language

(3) Grouping Provisions
(a) Students are grouped by rate of achievement (e.g., accelerated mathematics track).
(b) Students are grouped by special interest (e.g., art, band, chorus, orchestra or foreign language options).
(c) Students are grouped by ability for enrichment within the classroom in accordance with the school district's policy of mainstreaming (e.g., differentiated assignments).

THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

At the senior high school the program for gifted and talented students is realized within various subject areas and includes advanced placement courses in English, mathematics, social studies, science and foreign language as well as special opportunities in the areas of interdisciplinary fine arts and pratical arts. Opportunities for exceptional children are also available through extra curricular activities sponsored by the school district and through independent study, community learning projects and various forms of differentiated assignments. An outline of present opportunities follow:

(1) Acceleration Provisions

(a) Early admission to college classes
Students who qualify and wish to complete graduation requirements in less than four years in order to enter college early may earn a high school diploma upon presentation of transcript showing successful completion of first year of college.

Students may enroll at a local college or university to take a course not offered at the high school.

(b) High School Coursework

A student who demonstrated giftedness may accelerate in all academic disciplines and in fine and practical arts from junior high to senior high and within the senior high. Students may apply for admission to advanced and advanced placement classes. They are screened on the basis of achievement tests, ability tests, their scholastic record, teacher recommendations, the principals, recommendation and the pschologist's recommendation.

Advanced placement courses follow the respective CEEB syllabus for the first year college level course in that subject area. The remainder of the criteria is the same as that listed in honors.

An Honors course:

1. develops competency in a subject area and prepares students for the possibility of doing extensive college level work in the subject.
2. is rigorous and requires daily homework that goes beyond the classroom explanations. Most work is challenging at the higher levels of cognitive orientation. It may lead to or require independent work.
3. prepares for an area tested by a College Board Achievement Test.
4. demands higher than average reading skills.
5. deals in greater depth and includes additional topics beyond the regular level.

Present honors and advanced placement courses include:

English: Honors English 9, 10, 11, AP English 12, and Composition 5.
Mathematics: Algebra 1, 2, Geometry, Advanced Geometry, Advanced Algebra 2, Pre-Calculus, Advanced Pre-Calculus, Calculus, and AP (BC) Calculus
Computer Science: AP Computer Science
Social Studies: AP U.S. History, AP European History
Science: Honors Topics in Biology, AP Biology, Honors Chemistry, AP Chemistry, Honors Physics, AP Physics
Foreign Language: Honors French Level Four, AP French Level Five; Honors German Level Four, AP German Level Five; Honors Spanish Level Four, Honors Spanish Level Five.

(2) Enrichment Provisions

(a) Special Schools and special classes

The high school has a policy which permits students to enroll in special schools that meet their particular needs for a specified period of time as long as the students demonstrate competency in the courses they have missed when they return to high school.

(b) Independent Study

The fine and practical arts department offer students at any grade level the opportunity for independent study when they have completed the prescribed sequence in any one of the offerings.

(c) Fine and Practical Arts

There are a number of enrichment courses offered in these areas which are above and/or beyond the usual high school offerings. These are listed in the current Course Offering booklet.

(d) Contests

Students may enter the following contests:

American Association Teachers of French National French Contest
National Council of Teachers of English Writing Award
MAA Math Contest
Algebra I Contest
Carnegie-Mellon Problem Solving Contest
Computer Opportunities
Westinghouse Honor Institute for Science Students
Pennsylvania Junior Academy of Science
Pittsburgh Regional School Science & Engineering Fair
Secondary School Chemistry Contest
Physics Testing Competition
Physics Olympics
Biology Olympics

(e) Seminars/Community Resource Programs

Students may also participate in the following seminars and community resource programs:

Cultural arts guest artist series
Field trips
Planetarium programs K-12
Community resource speakers in classes
Volunteer assemblies
Fine arts department presentations during the school day and in the evening
Festivals: fine arts, practical arts, foreign language
Academic games
Junior Academy of Science
After-school clubs (interest areas)
Poetry forum
Oral history programs

Special summer programs offer students the opportunity to accelerate as well as take enrichment offerings.

(3) Grouping Provisions

Specific Curricular Offerings

Courses have been grouped in order that the level of difficulty of a given course will be clearly understood by those reading a completed transcript.

Advanced Placement courses follow the respective CEEB syllabus for the first year college level course in a given subject area.

An honors class

- develops competency in a subject area and prepares students for the possibility of doing extensive college level work in the subject.
- is rigorous and requires daily homework that goes beyond the classroom explanations. Most of the work is challenging at the higher levels of cognitive orientation and may lead to or require independent work.
- prepares for an area tested by a College Board Achievement Test.
- demands higher than average reading skills.
- deals in greater depth and includes additional topics beyond the regular level.

All of the course opportunities are listed in the Course Offerings Book which is published annually.

FORM 365G-JH/SH
IEP - 4/85

CONFIDENTIAL

MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT
7 HORSMAN DRIVE
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15228

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM PLAN for _____
(student name)

Signatures indicate acceptance of the Individual Education Program.

	Planning Participants' Signatures			Reviewed By:		
Grade & Date	Principal	Counselor	Parent	Counselor	Date	Comments
7th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12th _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

MT. LEBANON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT
PITTSBURGH, PA 15228

SEVENTH GRADE COURSE SELECTION FORM

DATE _____ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL _____ LAST NAME _____ FIRST NAME _____

Student and Parent/Guardian: The student is to complete Part C (subparts 1 and 2). The teacher will complete Part B. Parts A, D, and E are information items.

PART A - General Information: Every student is REQUIRED to take the following courses in 7th grade:

1. Full Year Courses Meeting 5 Days Per Week
   - o English
   - o Math (Math 71, Math 72, Honors PreAlgebra, OR Honors Algebra I)
   - o World Cultures
   - o Foreign Language OR Communications

2. Full Year Course Meeting 2 Days Per Week
   - o Physical Education

3. One Semester Course Meeting 2 Days Per Week
   - o Computer Science

4. One Semester Course Meeting 5 Days Per Week
   - o Art
   - o Science
   - o Health

5. Musical Experience (ONE OF THE FOLLOWING)
   - o Band, full year, 3 days per week OR
   - o Orchestra, full year, 3 days per week OR
   - o Chorus, full year, 3 days per week OR
   - o General music, one semester, 5 days per week

PART B - Elementary Teacher's Math Recommendation: _____ (Math Course)

PART C - Student's Choice of Electives

1. Foreign Language: Do you want to take a foreign language? YES NO (circle one)

   If you answered "yes," which foreign language: German, French, or Spanish? _____ (Print the foreign language here)

   If you answered "no" to the foreign language question, you will be automatically assigned to a communications class.

2. Musical Experience: Please check ONE (1) of the following:

   _____ * Band: instrument played _____ OR

   _____ * Orchestra: instrument played _____ OR

   _____ * Chorus OR

   _____ ** General music (learning to play the guitar)

PART D - Concerning Study Halls

* If you selected band, orchestra or chorus, you will have three (3) periods of study during one of the two semesters, and NO study halls the other semester.

** If you selected general music, you will have three (3) periods of study one semester and one (1) period of study the other semester.

SEE THE COURSE DESCRIPTION BOOKLET FOR SAMPLE SCHEDULES

PART E - AN IMPORTANT NOTICE TO BOTH PARENT/GUARDIAN AND THE STUDENT: Staffing needs, class size and room assignments of teachers for the coming school year are based on the number of students selecting courses in the spring. Computer schedule runs to achieve balanced classes are started in mid-May and finalized in late June. For these reasons we ask that you notify the Attendance Office of course selection changes by June 30th. We regret that we will be unable to accept course selection changes after June 30th. Thanks.

_____ (Student's signature)

_____ (Parent/Guardian signature)

Form 350
/85

Mt. Lebanon School District
Mt. Lebanon, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EIGHTH GRADE COURSE SELECTION FORM

School _____ Student's Name _____ Grade/Section ____ Date _____

I. Seventh Grade Teacher Recommendations — Teacher's Signature

A. The Mathematics recommendation is: _____ _____

B. The Fine Arts recommendation is:

1. Band _____ Instrument _____ _____
2. Orchestra _____ Instrument _____ _____
3. Chorus (vocal range): _____ _____
4. Guitar: . . . . . _____
5. Art: . . . . . _____

C. Foreign Language:

I (am, am not) now enrolled in a foreign language class.
I do ____ do NOT ____ plan on continuing with a foreign language which is _____. _____

II. Student/Parent Selection

A. Eighth graders are required to take the following subjects five days a week for the entire year:

1. English
2. Science
3. U. S. History
4. Practical Arts
5. Mathematics
6. Communications or Communications/Foreign Language

In a seven period day, one period remains to be filled. This period will be filled by Physical Education for one year, two days a week. The remaining three days will be filled by Study Hall or Fine Arts.

Select one of the following:

Band _____ Chorus _____ Orchestra _____
Guitar _____ Art _____ Study Hall _____

If you selected Band or Orchestra and the instrument played is not indicated in the Seventh Grade Teacher's Recommendation Section (Part I.), please indicate the instrument on which you have had training: _____

This form is to be signed by both student and parent. The student is to return the signed form to the _____ no later than _____.

Requests for changes after July 1st will not be accepted.

_____

Student's Signature Parent's Signature Date

FORM 366
11-80

MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15228

EXPLANATION OF DESCRIPTORS

I. PRESENT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE

A. DEPTH OF UNDERSTANDING

A student's grade may not always reflect his "flair" or "feel" for a subject. This item pertains to depth of understanding above and beyond factual mastery. You are asked to assess the student's insight into the essential structure and underlying principles of the subject.

- Excellent insight; exhibits unusual insight into essential structure of the subject and excellent appreciation of its "fine points," seems to have definite potential in the field
- Good understanding; has firm grasp of basic principles and concepts and manipulates these with relative ease; would probably do well in continued study in the area
- Some insight; has knowledge of basic principles and concepts, but cannot manipulate them easily
- Little insight; shows some awareness of basic concepts but does not fully grasp them
- Poor understanding; shows no understanding of basic concepts and little awareness of what subject is really about

B. INVOLVEMENT IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

A student may be highly involved in classroom activities, even though he seldom participates orally in discussions. You are asked to describe the degree of involvement this student usually exhibits in all classroom activities -- group projects, individual projects worked on during class time, group discussion, lectures, etc.

- Very high involvement; is alert and attentive from the time he enters the room, expressing high interest in what is going on - whether it be work on an individual project, some group activity, or a lecture
- Active involvement; may show definite preference for one type of activity over another, or may take time to "warm up," but usually shows some signs of genuine interest during all class sessions
- Mild involvement; is politely attentive and works diligently on his own, but seldom exhibits any overt signs of real interest or enthusiasm
- Languid interest; attention frequently wanders, or in other ways student appears generally uninterested
- Distracted; usually spends a good deal of time doing other things during class - e.g., writing notes, finishing other homework assignments, etc.

II. Appropriate Goals (Check the one which is most in keeping with the student's performance)

The key words in this section are underlined.

The goals chosen should consider:

- High-level; can handle material requiring higher cognitive reasoning for large segments of the course
- Advanced; can handle material that is not normally attempted at that grade level
- Average; can keep pace with the normal level and pacing of materials in a regular program
- Basic; need to engage in materials that reinforce fundamental skills or material in the subject

III. Appropriate Objectives (Check the highest level of objectives at which the student can work comfortably for some period of time)

These objectives are linked to particular activities in the subject field.

- Appraise and make evaluations of subject matter
  Appraises, compares, concludes, contrasts, criticizes, describes, discriminates, explains, justifies, interprets, relates, summarizes, supports
- Analyze and synthesize subject matter
  Breaks down, diagrams, differentiates, discriminates, distinguishes, identified, illustrates, infers, outlines, points out, selects, separates, subdivides, categorizes, combines, compiles, composes, creates, devises, designs, explains, generates, modifies, organizes, plans, rearranges, reconstructs, relates, reorganizes, revises, rewrites, summarizes, tells, writes
- Makes applications of subject matter
  Changes, computes, demonstrates, manipulates, modifies, operates, predicts, prepares, produces, relates, shows, solves, uses
- Recall and comprehend subject matter
  Defines, describes, identifies, labels, matches, names, outlines, reproduces, selects, states, converts, defends, explains, extends, generalizes, gives examples, infers, paraphrases, predicts, rewrites, summarizes

IV. Basis for Evaluation

A variety of means are used by teachers. The Gifted plan lists these alternatives:

1. Objective tests
2. Oral examination
   Interviews and conferences
3. Subjective tests
4. Observation of student performance
   Anecdotal records
5. Rating scales
   Check lists — Self evaluation
   Questionnaires — Peer nomination
6. Assessment of projects and research products

100

FORM 367
1/81

MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15243

SECONDARY GAT-I.E.P. SUPPLEMENT

School _____ Grade _____

Course Name _____ Instructor _____

Name _____

Subject Areas
English ___ Soc. Studies ___ Math ___ Science ___ Foreign Lang. ___ Communications ___ (Jr. H.S. only)

I. PRESENT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE
Choose one in each column

A. DEPTH OF UNDERSTANDING
- Excellent Insight ____
- Good Understanding ____
- Some Insight ____
- Little Insight ____
- Poor Understanding ____

B. INVOLVEMENT IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES
- Very high in all activities ____
- Active, shows genuine interest ____
- Mild, politely attentive ____
- Languid, attention often wanders ____
- Distracted, does other things ____

II. APPROPRIATE GOALS

Needs to experience high-level thinking and reasoning in this area. ____

Needs to experience efficient acquisition, retention, and use of advanced material in this subject area. ____

Needs to maintain or improve average skills in this subject area. ____

Needs to improve basic skills in this subject area. ____

III. APPROPRIATE OBJECTIVES
The student should be able to:

Appraise and make evaluations of subject matter ____

Analyze and synthesize subject material ____

Make applications of subject matter ____

Recall and comprehend subject matter ____

IV. BASIS FOR EVALUATION

Will be by professional judgment of the teacher ____

V. EXPECTED OUTCOME

Above average ____

Average ____

Below Average ____

101

MT. LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15228

PROGRAM PLANS

AND

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Area	Section
	INTRODUCTION	
A.	PHILOSOPHY	3.23-1
B.	ATTAINABLE GOALS	3.23-2
C.	MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES	3.23-3
D.	DESCRIPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION	3.23-4
E.	JOB TITLES AND DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES	3.23-5
F.	IDENTIFICATION, ASSESSMENT, PLACEMENT, AND ON-GOING INTERACTION WITH MAINSTREAM	3.23-6
G.	FACILITIES	3.23-7
H.	INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT	3.23-8
I.	SUPERVISION	3.23-9
J.	STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	3.23-10
K.	PROGRAM EVALUATION	3.23-11
L.	RELATIONSHIP TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	3.23-12
M.	RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL EDUCATION	3.23-13
N.	RELATIONSHIP WITH PRIVATE SCHOOLS	3.23-14
O.	RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER AGENCIES	3.23-15
P.	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	3.23-16
Q.	ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN CHART	3.23-17
R.	PROGRAMMATIC STRENGTHS AND NEEDS	3.23-18

INTRODUCTION

The Mt. Lebanon School Board recognized a long established position on schooling in its statement of philosophy approved as policy, February 13, 1974.

> "We believe it is the responsibility of the schools to provide education for children of all ability levels compatible with their maturity and emotional well-being. Educational content and processes must be consistent with concepts of child growth and development using a variety of learning experiences which provide a continuity of education for all pupils."

In December, 1975, the Mt. Lebanon School Board adopted a special education policy. The central statement from the body of the policy defines "mainstreaming", which is a key feature of this plan as proposed by the GAT Committee.

> "It is the policy of the Mt. Lebanon School District that every resident child will be provided with the opportunity for a free, public and appropriate education. To the maximum extent appropriate, exceptional children shall be educated with children who are not exceptional. This procedure is known as mainstreaming. Placement in special classes, separate schooling, or removal of exceptional children from the regular educational environment shall be used when the nature or extent of the exceptionality reasonably prevents appropriate education in regular classes."

The GAT Committee was charged with the task of describing schooling for the gifted and talented children in the Mt. Lebanon School District. This description was a response to the needs of the gifted child, the concerns and aspirations of the parents, school board and community, the expertise of the professional staff and a reasonable and appropriate commitment of community resources.

Guidelines provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Education have been used to describe how gifted students are to be identified and how programs are to be developed. Using the guidelines for identification of gifted students, approximately 15% of the Mt. Lebanon School District's population qualify.

A. PHILOSOPHY

Recognition of individual differences among children and the attempt to educate each child in terms of his or her own strengths, interests and potentialities are key features of democratic American educational practice. Provisions for individual differences necessitate offering developmental opportunities to students, including such groups as the mentally, physically or multi-handicapped, as well as the intellectually gifted and creatively talented.

Provisions made within the district for the gifted and talented should benefit all students by providing a variety of opportunities through which students can explore their own abilities. Placement in special groupings within the mainstream may be appropriate when a student's talents and other conditions suggest that the learning advantages of the special groupings outweigh known or expected disadvantages. Placement may be in any of several options within the regular program or a special education component, or a combination of these.

A program for gifted children should include opportunities to experience higher levels of cognitive thinking through enrichment, acceleration and/or grouping. "Enrichment" means providing for different learning experiences in a regular classroom, but not necessarily confined to it; "acceleration" refers to modifying a regular program to enable a student to complete the program in less time or at an earlier age than is usual; "grouping" involves placing students in separate classes according to some significant commonality, ability, interest, achievement or instructional activity.

The plan's effectiveness requires orientation of school personnel, students, parents and the community. Continuing evaluation of this program is essential to its viability.

B. SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM GOALS

1. To help students develop a readiness and willingness to learn and to apply advanced subject matter.

2. To help students develop the significant capabilities for problem solving and critical thinking.

3. To provide students with opportunities for discovery, intervention, and application of new ideas.

4. To provide opportunities for students to actualize their potentialities and/or interests in the areas of kinethesis, manipulative arts and crafts, performing arts, and mechanics.

5. To provide students with opportunities for criticism, challenge and change.

6. To provide opportunities for students to develop social responsibility and leadership.

7. To provide opportunities for students to develop a personal system of values, while at the same time tolerating the values of others.

8. To help students gain knowledge of the accepted ethics of their own social and political systems.

9. To provide opportunities for students to develop aesthetic appreciation and refined taste.

C. MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

1. The student will demonstrate efficient acquisition, retention, and use of information in advanced and diversified subject matter at all grade levels.

2. The student will demonstrate higher-level thinking, abstract reasoning, the ability to discriminate the ideal from reality, evidence from hearsay, propaganda from documented fact, and belief from empirical evidence.

3. a. The student will demonstrate fluent thinking; i.e., be able to generate a number of relevant responses to a learning challenge.

   b. The student will demonstrate flexible thinking; i.e., be able to take a variety of approaches to a learning challenge.

   c. The student will demonstrate original thinking; i.e., be able to generate unique high quality responses to a learning challenge.

   d. The student will demonstrate elaborative thinking; i.e., be able to embellish or embroider upon a simple idea.

4. a. The student will demonstrate exceptional coordination, balance, stamina, time sense, physical prowess, endurance, and healthy reserve of energy.

   b. The student will demonstrate the ability to integrate feelings and concepts.

   c. The student will demonstrate ability to visualize space in three dimensions.

5. a. The student will demonstrate risk-taking behavior; i.e., be able to function under conditions devoid of structure and open to criticism or failure, and be able to defend own ideas.

   b. The student will demonstrate a preference for complexity; i.e., be challenged to do in-depth examination and probing of an idea or problem.

   c. The student will demonstrate curiosity; i.e., be inquisitive and explore a learning challenge.

   d. The student will demonstrate imagination; i.e., have the power to visualize and build mental images, feel intuitively, and project from the known to the unknown.

6. a. The student will motivate, influence and inspire the action of others.

   b. The student will demonstrate social responsibility.

7. a. The student will demonstrate a capability for sympathy and empathy
&
8. b. The student will display a sense of humor.

   c. The student will demonstrate an appreciation for compromise.

9. The student will demonstrate an appreciation and discrimination of form, symmetry, harmony, and rhythm in the aesthetic modes.

E. JOB TITLES AND DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Central Administration

Superintendent of Schools
Director of Elementary Education
Director of Secondary Education
Coordinator of Pupil Personnel Services

Responsibilities:

a. Receive input from the professional staff, the school board, parent/community, and other appropriate parties to continually update the plan.
b. Design an on-going program of orientation, in-service, implementation and evaluation.
c. Keep school board informed of development and current status.
d. Receive and respond to school board policy and directives.
e. Receive and react to PDE regulations.
f. Maintain a working relationship with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit and the Western Pennsylvania Special Education Regional Resource Center.
g. Maintain a program to inform parents and the public of the opportunities for GAT pupils in the Mt. Lebanon schools.
h. Supervise due process activities.
i. Utilize evaluation results to bring about program improvement.

Principal of School

Responsibilities:

The principal will:
a. Administer at the building level the provisions of the school district's GAT plan.
b. Provide information about the GAT plan to staff and parents.
c. Provide appropriate notifications to parents and secure the required parental approvals for evaluation, placement and IEP plans.
d. Conduct the meetings of the building's multi-disciplinary committee for evaluation of candidates for placement on the GAT list.
e. Provide a system for notifying the building-level professional staff when students have been placed on the GAT list.
f. Preside at building-level conferences relating to due process activities.
g. Provide systematic procedures for the development, maintenance and review of records pertaining to GAT provisions and to GAT pupils.
h. Provide assistance to teachers with respect to interpreting and implementing the GAT plan.
i. Provide supervision of instructional activity relating to the GAT plan.
j. Promote cooperatively efforts among staff with related responsibilities in the GAT plan.
k. Use program evaluation results to bring about improvements.

Classroom Teacher

Responsibilities:

a. Become acquainted with the district's plan for meeting the needs of gifted and talented pupils.
b. Assist with the district's procedure for screening and identifying gifted and talented pupils.
c. Become familiar with relevant background information about any GAT student in the class group. Maintain appropriate records of current performance and accomplishment for each.
d. Assist, as appropriate by instructional level, in developing the IEP plans for GAT students; and, at the secondary level, prepare a supplemental IEP for each GAT student.
e. Gather instructional materials, structure lessons, and use support services to secure the implementation of the IEP plans.
f. Incorporate provisions for development of higher levels of cognitive functioning in class activities.
g. Assist with the conduct of the evaluative procedures and schedules as stipulated in the IEP plans.
h. Be able to make accurate reports of activities and provisions to meet the special needs of GAT students.
i. Attend in-service meetings devoted to implementation of the district's GAT plan and to instructional interventions appropriate for gifted and talented students.
j. Cooperate with assessments of the GAT plan.

Librarian

The librarian will provide three types of services which respond to the education of gifted students. At the elementary level, it is suggested that the equivalent of 30 to 40 percent of the librarian's schedule should be devoted to functions of the educational resource person in this general context with a portion of this allotment being given to direct supportive services with the highly gifted subgroup of pupils, FSIQ of 145 and above.

Type I — The librarian as educational resource person offers indirect supportive service to gifted students through consultation and cooperation with classroom teachers. This includes consultation about the special needs of gifted pupils and the furnishing of materials for adapting the basic instructional program to secure acceleration, enrichment or pursuit of interests.

Responsibilities:

a. Participate in orientation and in-service activites.
b. Become familiar with individual student needs, interests, goals, capabilites and rates of progress.
c. Confer with teachers and other professional personnel to promote the best interest of the children and to provide for efficient, effective mainstreaming.
d. Participate in case studies and/or other district approved activities designed to improve professional development in areas of student exceptionality.

Type II - The librarian as educational resource person offers direct supportive service to all GAT pupils by working cooperatively with the classroom teacher. This involves cooperative planning for program modifications, the designing of specific blocks of curriculum content, and discussion of instructional strategies and techniques for assessing differential pupil outcomes.

Responsibilities

a. Plan with individual teachers and groups of teachers to integrate library services and materials with the total teaching program.
b. Share with classroom teachers the responsibility for designing and implementing programs for GAT pupils.
c. Evaluate with the clasroom teacher the effectiveness of learning materials and experiences for GAT pupils in relation to their needs for acceleration, enrichment and interest
d. Participate in curriculum study and revision.

Type III — The librarian as an educational resource person offers specialized service to the highly gifted subgroup of GAT pupils (Full Scale Intelligence Quotient 145 and above) in the resource setting of the library.

Responsibilities:

a. Provide a setting that assures maximum accessibility and flexibility for independent study and effective library use.
b. Offer a wide variety of materials that expand the boundaries and interests of classroom activities as well as student interests and needs.
c. Assume the responsibility for the development of independent research and study skills.
d. Encourage the use of more advanced bibliographic techniques.

Gifted Program Coordinator/Junior High School

The Gifted Program Coordinator/Junior High School is responsible to the Director of Secondary Education and will consult with him on matters relating to her area of responsibility. The building principal is responsible for building level supervision of this coordinator's work.

General Responsibilities

a. Help to coordinate the delivery of "appropriate" educational opportunities provided to gifted children.
b. Helps make available and/or creates student tested learning materials appropriate to the unique needs of able learners, gifted, and highly gifted students.
c. Keeps abreast of current developments in the education of the gifted and communicates the same to administrative and teaching staff.
d. Translates and clarifies the gifted plan/junior high school for staff and community.
e. Participates in inservice planning and activities including needs assessment, program planning, evaluation and recommendations relative to the gifted plan.

Specific Duties:

a. Be acquainted with opportunities which are provided for the gifted child within the junior high school.
b. Works with classroom teachers and librarians in the development of high level instructional goals and objectives for use in the classroom, resource room or library.
c. Assists in monitoring and evaluating educational opportunities for gifted students.
d. Provides examples of appropriate educational opportunities which will help classroom teachers achieve the program and course level goals emphasizing higher levels of expected student behaviors as outlined in the gifted plan.
e. Develops, refines and recommends instructional materials for use in adapting the instructional program in order to secure acceleration, enrichment or pursuits of interests. (Plans cooperatively with librarian when appropriate.) Communicates potential resources to staff.
f. Works with resource personnel from the I.U. and other appropriate agencies to maintain and/or improve educational provisions for gifted students.
g. Maintains contact with associations which will enable the Gifted Program Coordinator to remain current and well informed on gifted education, instructional materials and special resources.
h. Works cooperatively with librarian and guidance personnel in the area of responsibility.
i. Consults with professional staff about the specific needs of gifted students and about the development, implementation and evaluation of IEPs.
j. Assists classroom teachers and/or librarian upon request by working directly with students in the resource room/classroom/library when schedules permit.
k. Assumes other tasks or duties assigned by the Director of Secondary Education or building principal.

Subject Area Coordinator (secondary schools)

Responsibilities

a. Assist teachers and other members of the professional staff to implement the GAT plan.
b. Provide assistance in acquiring instructional resources and identifying activities suitable for IEP's.
c. Plan or assist in the planning of professional and in-service meetings (in cooperation with other professional staff members) to realize the potential of the plan.
d. Assist with supervisory activities which aid in realizing the goals of the plan.

Guidance Counselor (secondary schools)

Responsibilities:

a. Assist in the process of referring, screening and identifying gifted and talented students.
b. Assist in providing and interpreting individual student data to staff, students and parents.
c. Counsel students and parents in making educational decisions.
d. Assist in the process of relating goal selections to career, vocational, avocational and educational plans.
e. Coordinate the development of IEP's and IEP supplements at the senior high school.
f. Participate in parent-teacher-student conferences when invited.
g. Observe, interpret and refer conflicts, problems, inappropriate practices and misunderstanding to psychologists, curriculum coordinators and other resource specialists for their study and recommended actions.
h. Assist the staff in resolving special problems encountered by students and teachers.
i. Assist in the establishment of lines of communication among all parties involved in the GAT plan.

Pupil Services Teacher (elementary schools)

Responsibilities:

a. Assist in the process of identification of gifted and talented students.
b. Assist in providing information and in the counseling of students to make the most appropriate educational decisions possible.
c. Provide accurate interpretation of individual student data for teacher, librarian, student and parent use.
d. Assist in the establishment of lines of communication among all parties involved in GAT.
e. Work directly with those underachieving GAT pupils who require remediation to reach expected levels of performance.

School Psychologist

Responsibilities:

a. Administer individual psychological evaluations to establish level of intellectual ability.
b. Provide interpretation of individual student data for use of staff, students and parents.
c. Assist in identification of students as gifted and talented.
d. Diagnose and refer cases involving emotional or other problems.
e. Work with other agencies in dealing with students with emotional or other problems.
f. Meet on request with staff members who are encountering special problems with students which they are unable to resolve themselves.
g. Provide consultation on individual problems involving teacher-to-teacher, student-to student, or student-to-teacher conflicts.
h. Provide individual student data concerning present educational level and strengths and assist in the development of IEP's.
i. Be available on a consultive basis to work out professional problems such as designing teachèr-learning strategies.
j. Propose formats, outlines and items for examinations, rating scales and evaluation devices.
k. Evaluate proposed items purporting to measure or evaluate human behavior such as teacher rating scales, pupil rating scales or the like.

School Nurse

Responsibilities:

a. Provide defined school medical services.
b. Be able to render necessary medical functions.
c. Maintain health records for all children of the building in the gifted program.
d. Supply relevant information about health or physical development to assist in making appropriate placement.

School Social Worker

Responsibilities:

a. Provide developmental history and serve as the liaison between family and school.
b. Serve as a liaison between the school and other agencies that provide services.

Psychiatrist

Responsibilities

a. Provide diagnoses and prescriptions for cases involving emotional or other problems.
b. Meet on request with staff members who are encountering special problems with students which they are unable to resolve themselves
c. Be available on a consultive basis to work out professional problems such as designing teacher-learning techniques.

F. IDENTIFICATION, ASSESSMENT, PLACEMENT, AND ON-GOING INTERACTION WITH MAINSTREAM

Identification

Candidates are referred for gifted and talented testing in one of three ways:

a. a group intelligence test score of 125 and above. (The Otis Lennon series is given in grades 1, 4, 7, 9 and 11, as well as to new students);

b. a nomination by the professional staff; or

c. a request from parents.

Assessment

After securing written parental consent, an individual psychological test is administered and evaluated by a school psychologist. One of the following tests may be used:

a. Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI)
b. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R)
c. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)
d. Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale

Placement

A building multi-disciplinary committee is appointed by the principal and may include the following: pupil services representative(s) (school psychologist, counselor, pupil services teacher, nurse, social worker, etc.), classroom teachers and/or resource personnel.

The multidisciplinary committee (with the principal or his/her designee as chairperson) evaluates each child's candidacy and determines GAT placement in accordance with the following:

a. Any student who earns an individual full-scale I.Q. of 130 or above is placed on the GAT list (state guidelines).

b. Any student who earns an individual full-scale I.Q. of 125-129 inclusive is placed on the GAT list IF the criteria listed below are met:

(1) Standardized achievement test scores in the superior range at or above the 95 percentile in national norms as follows:

Elementary

Reading
Word Study Skills
Language
Vocabulary
Listening Comprehension

Mathematics Concepts
Mathematics Application
Mathematics Computation

3.23-6-1

Junior High

Reading
Language
Vocabulary

Mathematics Concepts
Mathematics Application
Mathematics Computation

Senior High

Reading Comprehension
Mechanics of Writing
English Expression

General Mathematics

(2) Achievement at the superior level in daily class work as evaluated by the classroom teacher.

If the items listed above prove to be inconclusive, the multidisciplinary committee may collect data through use of the Renzulli-Hartman Scale when such input will assist in reaching a final placement decision.

The multidisciplinary committee may also recommend a date for reevaluation if a "do not place" decision is reached. Standardized test information and current class work achievement information will be updated prior to reevaluation for GAT placement.

All findings are treated as confidential information.

All information used for screening, the actions of the multidisciplinary committee and all pertinent information justifying each decision is recorded on an individual student profile which is maintained in the student's record folder.

Parents are notified of the multi-disciplinary committee decision by means of the approved district letters. Notice to the pupils is considered a family perogative (Exceptions shall be in accord with the school district policy entitled Retention, Maintenance and Disclosure of Student Records.)

Building principals will make the GAT listing available to teachers/counselors, along with names of those for whom testing was refused.

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Elementary (grades one through six)

The November "reporting-to-parent" conference includes IEP planning. Details of the process are found in "An Elementary Teacher's Guide for Developing an IEP," (Form 363G)

Secondary (grades seven through twelve)

In January of each year, teachers discuss with their students the courses available in that subject area in the succeeding year. Each teacher recommends the appropriate course in his/her subject area for each student. The student and parent discuss the options and teacher recommendation and indicate the course selected by signing the form. This course selection becomes part of that student's IEP.

In February, English, mathematics, social studies, science, and foreign language teachers (and communications teachers at the junior high) prepare an IEP supplement for each of their GAT students. This form indicates the student's present level of performance, his/her understanding of the subject, and involvement in classroom activities. It also includes appropriate goals and appropriate objectives for the subject, as well as expected outcomes for the student in that subject area. These forms become part of each GAT student's IEP.

In April or May, parents are asked to review and sign the IEP for the next school year. Parents are also asked to sign the Notice of Recommended Assignment once every two years.

At the end of the school year, each GAT-IEP is reviewed by the counselor. At least once every two years the review/reevaluation of the IEP is based on an analysis of the student's documented cumulative record by a team in accordance with state mandates. The team at the secondary level consists of the principal, school psychologist, and counselor. Teachers counsel students regarding course selection for the coming year. If a change in educational assignment is deemed appropriate, due process procedure must be satisfied prior to any change in the educational assignment of the child.

The process used to determine a child's progress as IEP's are implemented includes standardized testing (grades one through eleven), progress reports to parents and parent-teacher conferences.

Reporting to parents is accomplished by a regular schedule of reporting at nine-week intervals. Scheduled and non-scheduled parent-teacher conferences are part of the established reporting process. Progress reports to parents describe the student's current position in curricular sequences and give a comparative rating of performance in the described position and/or group.

Community reports are provided by the school district's public relations staff through public releases, joint monthly publications by the school district and the township, and the school district's descriptive publication, "Perspective."

On-Going Interaction with Mainstream

The mainstream program in the Mt. Lebanon School District addresses the concept of Continuous Progress and includes organizational mechanisms for the differential instruction of pupils. Within the mainstream program, many options meet the special needs of gifted and talented students. The available program possibilities for gifted students include the following elements at each level of the school structure:

A. The Elementary School

(1) Special Grouping Possibilities

(a) Cluster Grouping. Because of cooperative teaching patterns and the deployment of pupils among classrooms, small groups of gifted students may be placed together for specific study activities in a regular setting.

(b) Homogeneous Grouping. Pupils report to homerooms which are formed as heterogenous class groups, but study in subgroups which are formed according to a standard homogeneity of achievement in subject areas devoted to the development of basic skills (e.g., language arts, mathematics). The homogeneity of instructional subgroups is specific to the subject area.

(2) Enrichment in the Regular Classroom

(a) Pupil Projects. Special projects for advanced study and research in all subject areas enable selected pupils to study particular topics in greater detail and scope. These frequently culminate in student presentations to class groups.

(b) Supplemental Learning Kits. All buildings have learning kits for classroom use which allow pupils to proceed on an individual basis through sequences of instruction. The district provides reading, spelling, mathematics, and science labs in each building. Students may also study with kits of materials which deal with environment, map skills, metric measurement and listening skills. Additionally, the district provides, filmstrips, tapes and recordings. Audio-visual equipment - head sets and individual viewers - permit individualized use of audio-visual material in classroom settings.

(c) Special Subject Units. Supplemental units in all subject areas at every level permit brighter students to practice higher orders of mental functioning and advanced processes. Teachers are encouraged to plan regular units to include features for gifted students.

(d) Special Activities. Students have many opportunities to study topics with others who have similar interests in such subject areas as social studies and science. Other instructional alternatives include the use of educational television, simulations, and visits from community resource lecturers.

(3) Acceleration

(a) Nongraded Study. Students proceed through nongraded curricular sequences in reading and mathematics. Progress is based upon previous achievement and readiness to advance without regard for age or grade placement.

(b) Advanced Classes. Provisions are made for qualified pupils to study at advanced levels in various subject areas. On occasion, this alternative is accomplished through tutorial arrangements. In some cases, the student participates in classes of the secondary school for a portion of the school day.

(c) Multi-age Class Groups. Several elementary buildings in the school district assign pupils of two or three age groups to primary or intermediate classes. Gifted pupils in these groups have the opportunity for contact on a sustained basis with more mature classmates.

A. "The Elementary School" (continued)

(d) High Ceiling Curricular Provisions. When individuals have completed study in the materials designated for the grade level, teachers may continue instruction with text materials of higher grade levels.

(4) Opportunities for Specialized Study

These opportunities are an extension of the curriculum and are accompanied by pre- and post- lessons planned by the classroom teacher. Readiness for the specialized study is established and differential outcomes are expected.

(a) Planetarium Experiences. Pupils of the elementary levels have regularly scheduled instruction with a science teacher in the high school's planetarium.

(b) Field Trips. Teachers may schedule trips for class groups or selected students to cultural experiences or field study of places of interest.

(c) Cultural Experiences. All buildings have regularly scheduled performances by professional artists in music, drama, dance and other expressive arts.

(d) Instrumental Music Study. Children from the intermediate grades may elect to study instrumental music in small group lessons with opportunities for participation in performance of District-wide bands and orchestras.

(e) Fine Arts. Vocal music and art classes are taught by special subject teachers at the elementary levels. In addition to regularly scheduled classes, the special subject teachers provide enrichment opportunities via enrichment classes and/or chorus groups.

On-Going Interaction with Mainstream (continued)

The Junior High School

At the junior high school, the program for gifted and talented students is realized by a tracked program providing enrichment and acceleration in mathematics and by individualized study, projects and differentiated assignments provided by the professional staff in the various curriculum areas.

Classroom teachers may augment their provisions for GAT students by utilizing the services of the Gifted Program Coordinator and the librarian. Teachers may replace a student's previously mastered skill with curriculum-extending enrichment options developed by the Gifted Program Coordinator and the librarian. The student may work in the library, the resource room, or the classroom, depending upon the nature of he enrichment option and the time available. Some of these options are effectively used in the classroom by students who complete their classwork at a much faster pace than their classmates.

Special opportunities are also available in student election of foreign language, art enrichment, band, chorus, orchestra, and extra-curricular activities.

An outline of present opportunities follows:

(1) Enrichment Provisions

(a) Enrichment through differentiation

In library or project-oriented assignments

The student:

- works with more challenging topics or projects;
- uses a wider range of resource materials;
- uses more sophisticated resource materials; and
- shows analysis, synthesis, and, in some subject areas, evaluation. (See Bloom's Taxonomy)

(b) Enrichment through problem solving

The student deals with more complicated problems and puzzles which challenge his/her:

- background of concepts;
- current manipulative abilities (mathematics);
- ability to select appropriate concepts and processes;
- reasoning ability to logically synthesize; and
- ability to evaluate results

(c) Enrichment through multi-level instructional materials

The student uses supplemental books and printed materials which provide for:

- reading at a higher level;
- the investigation of a wider range of related materials; and
- a more detailed pursuit of topics of interest.

The student uses supplemental non-print materials (AV materials, laboratory materials, and practical arts materials) to provide for:

- the investigation of a wider range of related materials; and
- a more detailed pursuit of topics of interest.

The student will use games that may:

- stimulate acquisition and use of knowledge;
- encourage the broadening of concepts; and
- require research for role-playing.

On-Going Interaction with Mainstream (continued)

Junior High School Enrichment Provisions (continued)

(d) Enrichment through community resources
The Student may use community resources for investigating topics related to classroom activities.

(e) Enrichment by student option
Although the following courses are open to all students, additional enrichment activities will be provided for the gifted and talented student within the individual program of studies:

- Art
- Music (Band, Chorus, Orchestra)
- Foreign language (French, German, Spanish)

(f) Enrichment through supplemental academic options

- Field trips
- Co-curricular interest groups
- Reading resource rooms
- Libraries

(2) Acceleration Provisions
(a) Mathematics
(b) Early entry into foreign language

(3) Grouping Provisions
(a) Students are grouped by rate of achievement (e.g., accelerated mathematics track).
(b) Students are grouped by special interest (e.g., art, band, chorus, orchestra or foreign language options).
(c) Students are grouped by ability for enrichment within the classroom in accordance with the school district's policy of mainstreaming (e.g., differentiated assignments).

3.23-6-7

C. The Senior High School

At the senior high school the program for gifted and talented students is realized within various subject areas and includes advanced placement courses in English, mathematics, social studies, science and foreign language as well as special opportunities in the areas of interdisciplinary fine arts and practical arts. Opportunities for exceptional children are also available through extra curricular activities sponsored by the school district and through independent study, community learning projects and various forms of differentiated assignments. An outline of present opportunities follows:

(1) Acceleration Provisions

(a) Early admission to college classes
Students who qualify and wish to complete graduation requirements in less than four years in order to enter college early may earn a high school diploma upon presentation of transcript showing successful completion of first year of college.

Students may enroll at a local college or university to take a course not offered at the high school.

(b) High School Coursework
A student who demonstrates giftedness may accelerate in all academic disciplines and in fine and practical arts from junior high to senior high and within the senior high. Students may apply for admission to advanced and advanced placement classes. They are screened on the basis of achievement tests, ability tests, their scholastic record, teacher recommendations, the principal's recommendation and the psychologist's recommendation.

(2) Enrichment Provisions

(a) Special Schools and special classes
The high school has a policy which permits students to enroll in special schools that meet their particular needs for a specified period of time as long as the students demonstrate competency in the courses they have missed when they return to the high school.

(b) Independent Study
The fine and practical arts departments offer students at any grade level the opportunity for independent study when they have completed the prescribed sequence in any one of the offerings.

(c) Contests

Students may enter the following contests:

National Council of Teachers of English Writing Award
MAA Math Contest
Algebra I Contest
Carnegie-Mellon Problem Solving Contest
Computer Opportunities
Westinghouse Honor Institute for Science Students
Pennsylvania Junior Academy of Science
Pittsburgh Regional School Science & Engineering Fair
Secondary School Chemistry Contest
Physics Testing Competition
Physics Olympics
Biology Olympics

(d) Seminars/Community Resource Programs

Students may also participate in the following seminars and community resource programs:

Cultural arts guest artist series
Field trips
Planetarium programs K-12
Community resource speakers in classes
Volunteer assemblies
Fine arts department presentations during the school day and in the evening
Festivals: fine arts, practical arts, foreign language
Academic games
Junior Academy of Science
After-school clubs (interest areas)
Poetry forum
Oral history programs

Special summer programs offer students the opportunity to accelerate as well as take enrichment offerings.

(3) Grouping Provisions

Specific Curricular Offerings

Courses have been grouped in order that the level of difficulty of a given course will be clearly understood by those reading a completed transcript.

Advanced Placement courses follow the respective CEEB syllabus for the first year college level course in a given subject area.

An honors class

- develops competency in a subject area and prepares students for the possibility of doing extensive college level work in the subject.
- is rigorous and requires daily homework that goes beyond the classroom explanations. Most of the work is challenging at the higher levels of cognitive orientation and may lead to or require independent work.
- prepares for an area tested by a College Board Achievement Test.
- demands higher than average reading skills.
- deals in greater depth and includes additional topics beyond the regular level.

All of the course opportunities are listed in the Course Offering Book which is published annually.

G. FACILITIES

1. Existing facilities are assigned and scheduled by the building principal.

2. All facilities conform to the requirements of school building regulations prescribed by the Department of Labor and Industry.

H. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Necessary special equipment, supplies, and instructional materials are available for exceptional persons as may be indicated by their IEP. The above may be housed in classrooms or building libraries.

I. SUPERVISION

1. Supervisors' case load

a. Programmatic/Geographic

The building principal is responsible for supervising the program with the support of the Director of Elementary and Secondary Education

Elementary Schools:	No. of Classrooms
Foster	12
Hoover	11
Howe	18
Jefferson	13
Lincoln	12
Markham	13
Washington	14
Mellon Junior	32
Senior High School	79

2. Policies for evaluating and providing technical assistance to teachers are described in the school district publication, Teacher Evaluation Handbook.

3. Policies and relationships regarding supervision of supervisors.

a. All district-wide coordinators are evaluated either by the Superintendent of Schools or the Director of Secondary Education.
b. All building principals are annually evaluated by the Superintendent.

J. STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Educational services for GAT students are provided in their neighborhood school. The school district provides no home-to-school transportation.

K. PROGRAM EVALUATION

The district's evaluation plan is designed to provide information about the effectiveness of program inplementation and the extent to which the goals for the gifted and talented students are achieved.

1. Internal: An evaluation of the screening, selection and notification procedures, appropriate instructional provisions, and student outcomes has been conducted. An evaluation team, selected from the district's professional staff, has selected a Center for the Study of Evaluation design. The team utilized Dr. Jack Birch, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of School Psychology, as a resource.

2. Use of observation and recommendations from outside sources:

   a. The school district has sought expert opinions in the design and review of its GAT plan. The experts consulted include the following:
      1) Dr. Albert Oliver - University of Pennsylvania
      2) Dr. Earl McWilliams - IU #22
      3) Dr. Frank Williams - University of Oregon
      4) Dr. Jack Birch - University of Pittsburgh

   b. The school district appointed a Parent/Community Ad Hoc Advisory Committee during the 1976-77 school year. The AD Hoc Advisory Committee reviewed the GAT plan and were supportive of its features.

3. External: Internal evaluations precede any plans or decisions regarding third party external evaluation.

4. Extent of state program supervisor supervision:
   The Mt. Lebanon School District would welcome the observations and consultive services of the PDE with respect to Program and was recently successfully audited.

L. RELATIONSHIP TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1. Listing of Vocational School Openings

Gifted students may enter vocational courses at the senior high school or apply for admission to the area vocational technical school.

The Community Learning Program, a semester-long opportunity to study a career intensively, is offered to students in the second semester of the senior year.

2. Procedures for Enrollment in Vocational Education Programs

In cooperation with the staff of Parkway West Vocational Technical High School and Mt. Lebanon High School, tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade students are screened for admission to an appropriate vocational program. Students and parents are involved in this selection procedure. Prospective students and parents are provided the opportunity to visit the technical school. The staff at the technical school provides in-depth guidance regarding opportunities available at this school.

M. RELATIONSHIP WITH GENERAL EDUCATION

The gifted plan is administered by the building principal and operated in the educational mainstream by classroom teachers. The plan is augmented by the services of the Gifted Program Coordinator (at the junior high), the librarians, the guidance department and the school administration. Details may be found in section F.

N. RELATIONSHIP WITH APPROVED PRIVATE SCHOOLS

There are no approved private schools for gifted and talented students, K-12

The school district provides no service to gifted and talented students enrolled in non-public schools.

O. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER AGENCIES

With the exception of Carnegie-Mellon University, all contacts are for information and consultation. Math students from the senior high school may continue in an individualized higher math program at Carnegie-Mellon University.

Requests for information are initiated by the school district.

Relationship to Other State and Local Agencies
These other people and agencies are consulted when the need arises:

Chartiers Mental Health/Mental Retardation Base Service Unit
437 Railroad Street
Bridgeville, PA 15017

A cooperative relationship exists between the school district and Chartiers Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center. With parents' permission, there is a mutual sharing of information.

Western Pennsylvania Special Education Resource Center
Dr. Harold Chew, Director
5347 William Flynn Highway, Route 8
Gibsonia, PA 15044 (412) 443-7821

Instructional Support Services
Dr. James Schmunk, Assistant Executive Director
Allegheny Intermediate Unit #3
200 Commerce Court
Pittsburgh, PA 15219 (412) 394-5757

Gifted Programs
Bureau of Special Compensatory Education
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Field Assistant, Gifted Programs
Bureau of Special and Compensatory Education
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Gifted Resource Center
718 Wallace Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15221

Kenneth Chuska, GATE Program Administrator
Allegheny Intermediate Unit #3
200 Commerce Court
Pittsburgh, PA 15219 394-5818

Dr. Jack Birch
School Psychology Department
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Council of Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
(703) 620-3660

National Learning Resource Center of Pennsylvania
433 South Gulph Road
King Of Prussia, PA 19406

National Association for Gifted Children
8080 Spring Valley Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45236

R.I.S.E.
198 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

National Society for Study of Education
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637

National Clearinghouse for the Gifted and Talented
The Council for Exceptional Children
1411 Jefferson Daves Highway
Arlington, VA 22202 (703) 521-8820

National State Leadership Training Institute
on the Gifted and Talented
Civic Center Tower Building
316 W. Second Street, Suite 708
Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 489-7470

National Association of Gifted Children
9030 Darby Avenue
Northridge, CA 91324

P. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In June 1976 a GAT Committee recognized that a need existed for staff development training to review the district's position and to help all staff members become knowledgeable about the processes required for documentation of efforts to meet needs of pupils. Since the effort involved competencies required of all teachers, staff development efforts were directed to the improvement of instruction for all levels of pupil ability and focused on instructional decisions relating to strategies and techniques for classroom use, documentation and record keeping. In an attempt to continue to effectively respond to these concerns and to actively pursue a practical, realistic program for professional growth, the district has implemented a process and structure to deal specifically with staff development for teachers.

> "Staff Development is a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive, positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools." This definition of staff development prepared by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development has been adopted by Mt. Lebanon School District.

In order to more fully explain Mt. Lebanon's staff development program, its philosophy, program elements, resources and evaluation follow.

Philosophy

The district believes the staff development program should promote, foster, and improve the quality of the teaching/learning process and contribute to the effectiveness of teachers as they carry out their responsibilities.

The district believes that teachers function within a wide array of interrelated professional responsibilities. Those responsibilities include instruction, classroom management and administration, guidance, curriculum development, and community relations.

The district believes that by focusing upon specific goals and objectives, which are the stated goals and objectives of the district, all staff development activities can be correlated, integrated, and unified.

The district believes that the key ingredient in the teaching/learning process is the teacher. Thus, the staff development program must address the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for the most effective teaching.

The district believes that the principal is the key ingredient in promoting, fostering, and improving the quality of instruction within the schoolwide community of parent, students, and teachers.

The district believes that staff development needs should be determined by the elementary and secondary coordinators after considering information from teachers and principals and districtwide administrators.

The district believes that staff development activities should be collaboratively designed by a committee of teachers and administrators.

Program Elements

The elements of the staff development program are:

- a philosophy to provide direction;
- active administrative leadership in helping teachers understand our concept of staff development;
- a coordinator under the direction of the elementary and secondary curriculum coordinators to assist in planning, scheduling, implementing and evaluating activities;
- a committee consisting of an elementary teacher, a secondary teacher, a pupil personnel services teacher, the Elementary Curriculum Director, the Secondary Curriculum Director, the Pupil Personnel Services Director, chaired by the Staff Development Coordinator, shall exist to assist in planning and evaluating staff development activities;
- a commitment by the district to provide financial support for the program.

Resources

To provide appropriate support for the teaching staff, various resources are available within the staff development program. Some of these resources are professional day activities, conferences, continuing education, workshops, visitations and appropriate supervisory practices. In addition, the school district has organized and presented staff development programs specifically designed to meet the staff's needs for working with GAT children. The following individuals were used as consultants and directed inservice programs.

Erlene Minton
Orange Unified School District
Palo Alto, California

Dr. Earl McWilliams
Supervisor of Special Education
Bucks County , Pa.

Dr. Frank E. Williams
University of Oregon
"A Total Program for Humanizing and Individualizing the Learning Process"

Dr. Albert Oliver
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Jack Birch
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Bradley Seager
University of Pittsburgh

Don Schiele, I.U. #7
Westmoreland County

Kenneth Chuska, I.U. #3

Roger Meehan, I.U. #3

Norretta Bingaman, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Larry Knolle, University of Pittsburgh

Evaluation

The district recognized that a successful staff development program must achieve stated goals and objectives. Evaluation is, therefore, a necessary and critical aspect of the total program. Evaluation of staff development activities shall be of a dual nature. First, teaching staff shall provide input to the staff development committee regarding their immediate evaluation of activities. Second, supervisors shall provide input to the committee in terms of how successfully the staff development program translates into better teaching and learning. Thus, the administrative evaluation of staff development becomes an integral part of the supervisory process. Information from both teachers and supervisors can then be used to help revise and refine the staff development program as necessary.

Q. ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN CHART

Specific Programs/Services by Category

Category: Gifted

Date: August 15, 1983

Teacher	School District Building and Type	Students/ Class	Grade Levels	Org. Pattern	Aides	Severity Mild, Moderate, Severe
	Mt. Lebanon Elementary					
Float, Barbara	Foster	37	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Davidson, Shirley	Hoover	33	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Flick, Richard	Howe	40	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Snyder, Larry	Jefferson	28	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Dunbar, Donald	Lincoln	28	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Boyd, Pamela	Markham	26	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
Crawford, Leo	Washington	35	K-6	Mainstream	0	N.A.
	Junior High					
Wagner, John	Mellon	145	7-8	Mainstream	0	N.A.
	High School					
Mascetta, Joseph	High School	456	9-12	Mainstream	0	N.A.

R. PROGRAMMATIC STRENGTHS AND NEEDS

Programmatic Strengths

1. This program allows for curricular acceleration and horizontal enrichment.
2. Gifted students in this program are permitted the opportunity to tailor their own projects and enriching programs, and thus experience appropriate individualization.
3. The program provides individual help to students who are underachieving.
4. The program provides resource help for the mainstream teacher.
5. The GAT program provides more opportunity for library research and the improvement of learning skills.
6. All teachers are enabled to play a major role in counseling students regarding appropriate grouping and curricular choices.
7. Parents have the opportunity to learn about the program through an informational meeting.
8. Our professional staff is composed of members who average 18 years of teaching experience. Seventy-five percent hold master's degrees.
9. According to standardized test results, student achievement is commensurate with student scholastic aptitude.

Programmatic Needs

The District is currently conducting a program evaluation of the Gifted Program. Areas of strength and weakness will be identified for program improvement. This evaluation will be completed by December of 1984.